

**CRITICAL REMARKS
THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES**

ALEXANDER GEDDES

1800

Wipf and Stock Publishers

Bible Versions Reproduction Series: Volume #15

Critical Remarks on The Hebrew Scriptures: corresponding with

A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE

Remarks on the Pentateuch

By: Alexander Geddes

1800 Original Publisher, The Author

490 pages

Copyright © 2000 by John S. Wipf, Jr. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. Except as permitted under the United States Copyright Act of 1976, no part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a data base retrieval system, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Wipf and Stock Publishers is pleased to present to you its digital reproduction of this book. By purchasing this book and receiving ownership of this copy, you expressly agree that you and any one to whom you transfer this book to is not entitled to reproduce or to allow anyone else to reproduce all or any portion of its contents without our prior consent.

If the purchaser does not agree to the foregoing terms of this sale, promptly return this copy for a refund of the purchase price. By retaining possession of this copy, you acknowledge that you agree to be bound by the foregoing terms. If you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact Wipf and Stock Publishers at the following address:

Wipf and Stock Publishers
1396 E. Washington Blvd.
Pasadena, CA, 91104
1-626-797-4756

Printer: James Baden
Binder: Golden Rule Bindery

ISBN: 1-57910-364-2

Bible Versions Reproduction Series

The purpose of the **Bible Versions Reproduction Series** is to make rare and out-of-print versions of the Bible readily and inexpensively available to scholars, Bible students, and Bible collectors. These reproductions are being offered especially to members of the International Society of Bible Collectors.

While still searching for hard-to-find original printings of Bible translations, many collectors have indicated what a delight it would be to have on their own shelves accurate reproductions of Bible versions currently available only in museums, libraries and private collections. Now such an opportunity is being offered by a collector who is himself a member of our Society.

It would be rare to imagine a more enthusiastic member of the ISBC than my long-time friend Jim Baden. Since joining the Society, he has amassed an extraordinary collection. Visiting his library could be a temptation to violate the tenth commandment were it not for his great generosity and eagerness to share what he has brought together.

It is essential, of course, that the reproduction process pose no threat to the integrity of the volumes being copied—no matter how fragile the precious originals may be. Such a method is now available, and Jim is demonstrating his confidence in the process by being the first to make some of his own prized volumes available.

Among the first publications in this Series is a reproduction of Isaac Leese's 1904 *The Twenty-four Books of the Holy Scriptures*. Society members will especially enjoy knowing that the particular volume by Leese was once the personal copy of Arnold Ehlert, the founder and first president of the ISBC. "A gift to A. D. Ehlert from Dr. H. A. Ironside, summer 1947" is handwritten on the flyleaf.

Jim Baden shares the reverence for Scripture that has moved the leaders of our Society to give so freely of their time and energy for the past thirty-five years. He has profound respect and gratitude for the heroes and heroines of Bible translation—from Wycliffe and Tyndale down to the present time—who worked so hard, even sometimes at the risk of life—to make the Bible so readily available to the world today. Like other members of the ISBC, Jim regards the Bible as more than just a great book to be collected. To use his own words, he speaks of the Scriptures as "God's method of communicating with his intelligent creatures . . . to be most carefully read and contemplated to discover its meaning and value for life in the present and future."

What is more helpful in discovering the meaning of Scripture than to have readily at hand a good collection of different versions? Some have even suggested they would rather have a variety of versions than commentaries! As the translators of the 1611 King James Version quote Saint Augustine in their memorable preface, " 'Variety of Translations is profitable for the finding out of the sense of the Scriptures.' " "Therefore blessed be they," the preface continues, "and most honoured be their name, that break the ice, and giveth onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls. Now what can be more available thereto, than to deliver God's book unto God's people in a tongue which they understand?" And speaking of those who have labored to prepare translations other than the King James, the 1611 scholars urge "that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God, for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance."

It is in this spirit and for this purpose that the **Bible Versions Reproduction Series** has been inaugurated.

William E. Paul, Editor, *Bible Versions and Editions*; Don Heese, Journal Production Manager; Sid Ohlhausen, Membership Secretary; Mark Mage, Editorial Assistant; Jim Baden and this writer have each supplied several hard-to-find versions for this reproduction. *

It is hoped that purchasers of volumes from this series will loan for copying other versions and editions that will become part of this reproduction Series. Those so doing will be rewarded with a free copy of a version of their choice from the Series.

Those interested are urged to contact the Publisher or Sidney Ohlhausen, Membership Secretary of the International Society of Bible Collectors, at: Box 20695, Houston, TX. 77225.

Graham Maxwell
(Charter Member #12)

*additional versions supplied by:
Bill Chamberlain

ALEXANDER GEDDES 1737-1802

Priest, scholar, and pioneer of modern Biblical criticism.

Alexander Geddes was born in Ruthven, Banffshire in the Scottish Highlands. His parents taught him early to read the Bible. Although Catholic, they used the King James Version rather than the Douay. In 1751 the young Geddes began preparation for the priesthood by entering a minor seminary at nearby Scanlan. Uncomfortable with the local harsh climate and seeking more advanced study, he moved in 1758 to the Scots College in Paris. That city at the time was a center of liberal views toward religion. In this atmosphere, Geddes completed his religious education and was ordained. Here also he first conceived his translation of the Bible into English.

Geddes returned to Scotland in 1764. He spent the next several years at various rural pastoral assignments, the longest at Auchinhalrig. With his Continental education, intelligence and wit, he made numerous influential friends. His early poetic work, *Select Satires* of Horace translated into English verse, won the admiration of a group of intellectuals who recommended him for an LL.D. degree from Aberdeen. Geddes also worked to reconcile differences between local Catholics and Protestants. However, he became too close to some of the Protestant clergy to suit his ecclesiastical superior, Bishop George Hay. Geddes' financial management problems and irritable temperament compounded his problems with Hay, who forced him to resign from Auchinhalrig in 1780. In the following year, Geddes moved to London where he accepted the post of chaplain at the Austrian Imperial Embassy.

It was in London that Geddes would embark upon his translation of the Bible. Lord Petre, a prominent Catholic nobleman, wanted to provide his co-religionists with a new revision of the Douay Version that would supersede the one made earlier in the century by Bishop Challoner. After Geddes had served a few months at the embassy chapel, Lord Petre accepted him as a pensioner and offered him full support to work on the proposed revision. When the Catholic hierarchy learned of the enterprise, they became concerned and advised they were pursuing their own revision. Because of this, Geddes abandoned the idea of revising the Douay and decided to proceed with a primary translation. He began work in 1782.

To prepare the way for his new translation, Geddes published a series of preliminary works. The most notable of these was his *Prospectus of a New Translation of the Holy Bible* appearing in 1786. This discusses the reasons for a new translation, provides a scholarly critical history of earlier translations, and lists the qualities of a good translator. Geddes makes it clear that he is a strong advocate of the new concepts of Biblical criticism then spreading throughout Europe. Discussing his own proposed Old Testament, Geddes states his translation will be "neither literal nor verbal: but, if I may use the term, strictly *sentential*; that is, every sentence of the English

corresponds as exactly to the Hebrew, as the difference of the two idioms will permit."

The first part of Geddes' Bible appeared in 1792 covering Genesis through Joshua. Lord Petre's generous resources made possible an impressive large quarto volume. Most of the Catholic Bishops of England censured the work. Geddes' superior, Bishop John Douglass, also suspended him from priestly functions. Protestant reviews were mixed. Although some praised Geddes' work, his denial of Biblical inspiration and attachment to German rationalistic principles were unacceptable to most of the contemporary English clergy. Geddes did not help his case by taking numerous doubtful liberties such as inserting verses 11 & 12 of Exodus 16 immediately after verse 3.

Anxiety and resulting ill health brought on by the criticism from within his own church delayed but did not stop Geddes' work on the translation. The second volume appeared in 1797. It included Judges through II Chronicles with "the little pleasant story of Ruth" placed out of its normal order toward the end, followed by the apocryphal Prayer of Manasseh. The Preface to the second volume apologizes for the delay in its publication and optimistically projects "more regular" appearance of subsequent volumes.

In 1800 Geddes brought forth an extensive and scholarly commentary on the Pentateuch. Again with optimism, it is styled "Volume I," in anticipation of a complete commentary that was to supplement the complete Bible. However, nothing further would be published during Geddes' lifetime. Continuing ill health compounded in 1801 by shock at the death of his patron, Lord Petre, resulted in his own death early in the following year.

The fate of Geddes' unpublished manuscripts remains a significant unresolved issue. It was widely believed that he had completed much more of his translation. These manuscripts were supposedly destroyed either by Geddes himself in anticipation of his death or possibly by an enemy who furtively gained access to them. In any case, only his translation of the Psalms through 118:11 has come down to us. It was published in 1807 under the joint editorship of a Catholic (Charles Butler) and a Protestant (Rev. John Disney), both friends of Geddes.

Dictionary of National Biography; FULLER, Reginald C., *Alexander Geddes 1737-1802 A Pioneer of Biblical Criticism* (Almond Press, Sheffield, 1984); GEDDES, Alexander, *Prospectus of a New Translation of the Holy Bible* (Glasgow, 1786); GILLOW, Joseph, *Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics* (Burns & Oates, London [1895-1902]).

Sidney K. Ohlhausen is a collector of antiquarian books specializing in English language Catholic editions of Scripture. His large collection includes many items not noted in Bible bibliographies. He has had several works published in scholarly journals regarding interesting items in the collection and is author of a history of the Douay Version appearing in the May-June 1999 issue of *Catholic Heritage* magazine. He is Membership Secretary of the International Society of Bible Collectors and is a member of the following organizations: Catholic Record Society, Friends of Ushaw, North West (England) Catholic History Society, and the Latin Liturgy Association. He is a lifelong resident of Houston.

CRITICAL REMARKS
ON
THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES:

CORRESPONDING WITH
A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE,

BY
THE REV. ALEXANDER GEDDES, LL. D.

VOLUME I.
CONTAINING
REMARKS ON THE PENTATEUCH.

L O N D O N:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR BY DAVIS, WILKS, AND TAYLOR:
AND SOLD BY R. FAULDER, NEW BOND-STREET; AND J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S
CHURCH-YARD.

MDCCC.

TO THE READER.

IT was once my intention to prefix to this volume of **CRITICAL REMARKS & DISSERTATION** on Biblical, or, as it is commonly called, Sacred Criticism; and to conclude with a methodical **DIGEST** of the Laws of Moses, compared with those of other nations: but the **Remarks** themselves have swelled to so great a size, that I have been under a sort of necessity to drop, for the present, both those projects; and reserve them for some other, perhaps more apt, occasion.

THE otherwise exuberant bulk of the volume has been principally owing to my having, at the request of many of my subscribers, been obliged to adopt a larger typographical character than that in which my **SPECIMENS** were printed; and which was, indeed, too minute and close for the eyes of most readers. I have, therefore, exchanged it for that of my **PREFACES**; and am happy to find that this alteration meets the wish of all who have seen the printed sheets.

IN truth, no cost nor pains have been spared to make the page as uniformly elegant as possible; and it is presumed, that few better printed books have, in latter times, issued from the press. Appropriate Greek and Hebrew types have industriously been adjusted to the English; and, for the same purpose, the numerous quotations from the Samaritan, Syriac, Arabic, and Persic languages have been printed in Hebrew letters. This, perhaps, will by some be accounted an imperfection; and, I confess, it was not without reluctance that I ultimately resolved on such a method. The following reasons got the better of that reluctance:

FIRST, it would have been no easy matter to find, even in this great metropolis, sets of Samaritan, Syriac, and Arabic characters in any degree suitable to the face of either our Roman or Italic letters: and if such could have readily been found, it would have been extremely difficult to find a compositor capable of putting them together; without an attention and trouble, on my part, hardly to be conceived.

SECONDLY, I considered, that there are many Biblical Hebrew scholars but little acquainted with the other Eastern dialects; who yet might wish to see the analogy which these bear to the Hebrew, and to one another: to such, I apprehend, it will be more agreeable to find my quotations from those dialects presented in Hebrew characters; while the thorough Orientalist will thereby lose nothing, as he can, in idea, most readily substitute the Samaritan, Syriac, and Arabic signs.

THE Hebrew and the Chaldee are universally printed in the same characters; nor has any the smallest inconvenience hence arisen: yet the Chaldee dialect differs as much from the Hebrew as the Syriac or Samaritan.—The Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch in Houbigant's and Kennicott's editions of the Hebrew Bible, without being less complete, is more easily and expeditiously compared with the Masoretic text, than that in the Paris and London Polyglotts: and the Syriac New Testament in the editions of Plantin and Boderianus is to the learner, who has only a previous knowledge of Hebrew, not less useful, and much more pleasant, than in the editions of Widmanstad and Schaaf.

ALL this, I believe, will be readily granted; as the Samaritan and Syriac alphabets have exactly the same number of letters with the Hebrew and Chaldean alphabet: but how, it may be asked, can the Arabic and Persian alphabets (the former of which consists of 28 letters, the latter of 32) be reduced to 22 Hebrew characters? I answer, Most easily: the Arabic alphabet, latterly adopted by the Persians, had at first no more letters than the Hebrew and Syriac alphabets, and was arranged in the same order. At present it has fewer symbols, independent of its diacritic points; and, even with these, it has not so many vocal powers as the Hebrew alphabet. This latter has a double *beth*, a double *ghimel*, a double *daleth*, a double *chaph*, a double *phé*, a double *sin*, and a double *thau*, not to mention the various powers of the *matres lectionis* א, ה, ו, י; which would considerably increase the number.

In fact, every alphabet, at first, must have had just as many letters as were necessary to denote the sounds of the language for which it was framed. But language, in process of time, and from various causes, acquires novel sounds; and either these must be expressed by new symbols, or a new power given to those already in use*. The Arabs followed this latter method. They contented themselves with the small number of 22 primitive elements†, which they borrowed from the Syrians; but as they had more sounds to express than those elements could denote, they gave to most of them a double power, by adding certain arbitrary marks either above or below the letter; by Grammarians called *diacritic points*. If, then, these diacritic points, or others equivalent, can be equally well adjusted to Hebrew characters, there is no reason why Hebrew characters may not be employed in writing and printing Arabic, and consequently Persian. Nor is this at all a new device. The whole Arabic Pentateuch was first printed, at Constantinople, in Hebrew letters; and in Schindler's Pentaglott, the Arabic words are throughout expressed in the same manner. I am not even sure, but that the Arabs would have done better to adopt entirely the Hebrew alphabet, than to have formed the one which they use; in which the sameness of certain characters is apt to beget confusion, and has been the source of many mistakes, through the carelessness of transcribers in omitting or changing the diacritic marks of distinction. Besides, in using the Hebrew characters, fewer diacritic marks are needful. There is no need of discriminating א from א, י, or ה; nor these from one another. There is no need of discriminating ב from ב, nor ו from ו, nor ז from ז, nor י from י. Only six letters in Arabic, and ten in Persian, require to be distinguished, when printed in Hebrew characters: whereas in the Persian and Arabic alphabets there are not less than 14 diacritic marks necessary in the latter, and 19 in the former.—I have therefore only to inform my readers what discriminating marks I have used in this work. A single point over certain letters performs the whole office. The Arabic *afal* and the Persian *dal* are represented thus ۞; the Arabic *cha* and the Persian *che* thus ۞; the Arabic *da* and the Persian *fa* thus ۞; the Arabic and Persian *gain* thus ۞; the Arabic *dad* and the Persian *zad* thus ۞; the Persian *pe* is marked thus ۞, the *zbe* thus ۞, *gaf* thus ۞; and the Arabic *thfa* and the Persian *te* thus ۞.

It remains to give some account of the nature of the volume which I now offer to the public. In my translation and explanatory notes I have made it a rule to confine myself to the limited province of a mere interpreter; endeavouring to give a faithful version of my corrected originals, without comment or criticism. In the following remarks I have taken a wider and bolder range: I have throughout acted the critic, and occasionally the commentator; although the office of the latter has always been made subservient to that of the former. In both these characters I have freely used mine own judgment (such as it is) without the smallest deference to inveterate prejudice or domineering authority. The Hebrew scriptures I

* This may be illustrated by our own alphabet, which we had from the Romans. It then consisted of only 23 elements; but now it consists of at least 30; without including the various powers of our vowels. And it is remarkable that, in this augmentation of our alphabet, we have partly followed the one and partly the other of the methods above mentioned. We have invented new symbols for *i* and *u* become consonants: but have to *c*, *f*, *g*, *s*, *j*, and *x*, assigned a double sound, without changing the name or figure; which is a real defect, not only in our, but in most modern alphabets. How a child is puzzled, when he is this moment told that *ca* is *ka*; in the next that *ce* is *se*; that *ga* is *gha*, but that *ge* is *je*!

† Strictly speaking, the modern Arabic alphabet has but 16 characters: as its *be*, *te*, *nun*, and *ze*, have but one form; and so have its *ayb* and *pe*, and its *so* and *re*, although their powers be totally different.

have examined and appreciated, as I would any other writings of antiquity; and have bluntly and honestly delivered my sentiments of their merit or demerit, their beauties or imperfections; as becomes a free and impartial examiner.—I am well aware, that this freedom will, by the many, be considered as an audacious licence; and the cry of *heresy! infidelity! irreligion!* will resound from shore to shore. But my peaceful mind has been long prepared for, and indeed accustomed to, such harsh Cerberian barkings: and experience has made me (not naturally insensible) callous to every injury, that ignorance or malice may have in store for me.

I ONLY enter my protest against downright misrepresentation and calumny. I disclaim and spurn the imputation of irreligion and infidelity. I believe as much as I find sufficient motives of credibility for believing: and without sufficient motives of credibility, there can be no rational belief. Indeed, the great mass of mankind have no rational belief. The vulgar Papist and the vulgar Protestant are here on almost equal terms: few, very few of either class ever think of seriously examining the primary foundations of their faith.

THE vulgar Papist rests his on the supposed infallibility of his church; although he knows not where that infallibility is lodged, nor in what it properly consists: it is to him a general, vague, indefinite idea, which he never thinks of analysing. He reads in his catechism, or is told by his catechist, that *the church cannot err in what she teaches*; and then he is told, that this unerring church is composed only of those who hold communion with the bishop of Rome, and precisely believe as he, and the bishops who are in communion with him, believe. From that moment reason is set aside; authority usurps its place, and implicit faith is the necessary consequence. He dares not even advance to the first step of Des Cartes's logic; he dares not doubt: for in his table of sins, which he is obliged to confess, he finds *doubting in matters of faith* to be a grievous crime.

BUT, on the other hand, is the faith of the vulgar Protestant better founded? He rests it on a book, called the Holy Bible, which he believes to be the infallible word of God. Is it by reading the Bible, and unbiassedly examining its contents, that he is led to this precious discovery? No: he is taught to believe the Bible to be the infallible word of God, before he has read, or can read it; and sits down to read it with this prepossession in his mind, that he is reading the infallible word of God. His belief, then, is as implicit as that of the vulgar Papist; and his motives of believing even less specious. Both give up their reason, before they are capable of reasoning; the one on the authority of his parents, or of his priest; the other on the authority of his parents, or of his parson: but the priest urges his plea with more dexterity, and with a fairer outside show of probability. If the parson be asked how he himself knows that the book which he puts into the hand of his catechumen is the infallible word of God; he cannot, like the priest, appeal to an unerring church; he acknowledges no such guide: and yet it is hard to conceive what other better argument he can use. If he say, that the book manifests its infallibility by its own intrinsic worth, he begs the question. If he affirm, that he knows it to be infallible by the workings of the Holy Spirit in his heart, he plays the enthusiast; and *his* enthusiasm can be no rational motive of credibility for any *other* individual, who feels not the like operations of the same Spirit. Twenty other difficulties surround his hypothesis, which it certainly is not easy to remove; and the best solutions he can give, are but gilded sophisms.—On reading the *papist controversy*, as it is called, from the days of Elizabeth to the present day, one is apt, at least I am apt, to think, that the Romanists had, on this point, the better side of the question; by some of their controversialists not improperly called the *question of questions*.—Yet this same question of questions has never been satisfactorily solved by the Romanists themselves. They always reasoned in what is termed a *vicious circle*; and proved the infallibility of the church from the authority of scripture, and the authority of scripture from the church's infallibility. I know what shifts have been made by Bellarmine, Becan, and many others, to get out of this coil; but I have never met with any one who had succeeded.

ON the whole then, I think, it may be laid down as an axiom, that the bulk of Christians, whether Papists or Protestants, cannot be said to have a rational faith; because their motives of credibility are not rational motives; but the positive assertions of an assumed authority, which they have never discussed, or durst not question: their religion is the fruit of unenlightened credulity. A very small number, of
curious

curious and learned men only, have thoroughly examined the motives of their religious belief, in any communion : and it will be found, I presume, that the more curious and learned they were, the less they generally believed. Hence, perhaps, the old adage : *Ignorance is the mother of devotion*.

WITHOUT ranking myself with the *learned*, I may safely class myself with the *curious*. I have been at great pains to examine every system of theology, that has come in my way, in order to fix my religious belief on something like a sure foundation. I have searched the scriptures ; I have studied tradition ; I have read ecclesiastical history : and the result of my search, my study, and my reading has been, that reason, reason only is the ultimate and only sure motive of credibility ; the only solid pillar of faith.

I CANNOT, then, be charged with *infidelity*, since I firmly believe all that reason tells me I ought to believe : nor can I be charged with *irreligion* ; because I am conscious that Religion, genuine Religion, is both reasonable, and conducive to human happiness. So far from wishing to hurt the interests of this Religion, I have the most ardent desire to promote her injured cause ; to exhibit her in her native, divine charms ; divested of every vain and useless trapping, and tinsel decoration, in which the busy hand of superstition hath officiously attired her : and, at the same time, to rescue her, if possible, from the sacrilegious fangs of gloomy fanaticism, that would clothe her in the sable weeds of forbidding austerity ; and expose her as a haggard scare-crow, to deter the liberal and generous part of mankind from her sweet embrace.

THE gospel of JESUS is my religious code : his doctrines are my dearest delight : " his yoke (to me) is easy, and his burden is light : " but this yoke I would not put on ; these doctrines I could not admire ; that gospel I would not make my law, if Reason, pure Reason, were not my prompter and preceptress. I willingly profess myself a sincere, though unworthy disciple of Christ : *Christian* is my name, and *Catholic* my surname. Rather than renounce these glorious titles, I would shed my blood : but I would not shed a drop of it for what is neither Catholic nor Christian. Catholic Christianity I revere wherever I find it, and in whatsoever sect it dwells : but I cannot revere the loads of hay and stubble which have been blended with its precious gems ; and which still in every sect, with which I am acquainted, more or less tarnish or hide their lustre. I cannot revere metaphysical unintelligible creeds, nor blasphemous confessions of faith. I cannot revere persecution for the sake of conscience, nor tribunals that enforce orthodoxy by fire and faggot.—I cannot revere formulas of faith made the test of loyalty, nor penal laws made the hedge of church-establishments. In short, I cannot revere any system of religion, that, for divine doctrines, teacheth the dictates of men ; and by the base intermixture of " human traditions maketh the commandments of God of none effect." This I say even of Christian systems : and shall I grant to systematic Judaism what I deny to systematic Christianity ? Shall I disbelieve the pretended miracles, the spurious deeds, the forged charters, the lying legends of the one, and give full credit to those of the other ? May I, blameless, examine the works of the Christian doctors and historians by the common rules of criticism, explode their sophistry, combat their rash assertions, arraign them of credulity, and even sometimes question their veracity ; and yet be obliged to consider every fragment of Hebrew scripture, for a series of 1000 years, from Moses to Malachi ; every scrap of prophecy, poetry, minstrelsy, history, biography, as the infallible communications of heaven, oracles of divine truth ? Truly, this is to require too much from credulity itself.

IN the Hebrew scriptures are many beauties, many excellent precepts, much sound morality : and they deserve the attentive perusal of every scholar, every person of curiosity and taste. All those good things I admit, and admire, and would equally admire them in the writings of Plato, Tully, or Marcus Antoninus : but there are other things, in great abundance, which I can neither admire nor admit ; without renouncing common sense, and superseding reason : a sacrifice which I am not disposed to make, for any writing in the world.

THIS language will, I doubt not, seem strange to the systematic Christian, who has founded his creed, not upon reason or common sense, but on the prejudices of education ; who is a Papist at Rome, a Lutheran at Leipzig, and a Calvinist at Geneva ; a Prelatist in England, and a Presbyterian in Scotland ;

a Nestorian

a Nestorian in Syria, in Armenia an Eutychian—for such local nominal Christians my Remarks were not intended: they would spurn them with zealous indignation. But if there be, as I trust there are, in each of those communions, men who have learned to think for themselves, in matters of faith as well as in matters of philosophy, and who are not Christians merely because they were born of Christian parents, and bred up in Christian principles; but because, on the most serious and mature examination, they find Christianity a rational, a most rational religion—to such I address myself with confidence; and by such I expect to be listened to with patient candour.

To such I would say: It is time, it is full time, that Christianity should learn to walk alone, without Jewish leading-strings or Gentile go-carts. It is time, that the pure spiritual religion of Jesus should throw aside all the taudry cumbersome load of exotic ornaments, borrowed either from Judaism or Paganism, from the temple of Jerusalem or the temples of Jupiter; and reclathe herself in the white spotless robes, in which she was originally invested.—It is time for her rational admirers to vindicate her chaste character from the aspersions of her professed enemies, and from the false praise of her pretended friends: for the false praise of her pretended friends has been often more injurious to her reputation, than the obloquy of her professed enemies: or, rather, she has had no enemies; but because her pretended friends have exhibited her in a dress which she disclaims and despises. Strip her at once of this ungainly meretricious garb; restore her to her primitive simplicity; and she will need only to be seen, to be admired, loved, idolized!—Her charms have made me warm in her cause:—but I must stop the rapidity of my pen; and fall gently back to my more immediate subject.

It will be expected, perhaps; nay, it has been suggested, by some of my well-wishers, that I should here take some notice of the various *censures* (for I cannot call them *critiques*), that, in the course of six or seven years, have been made on the two volumes of my Translation already published. For the present, I beg to be excused, as I really think I can better employ my time, than in wantonly running my head against every post or wind-mill, which I may happen to meet. What, indeed, would they have me notice? The effusions of ignorance or malignity? Most of my *Censurers* are anonymous scribblers, who insidiously aim their shafts at me from behind a bush; and on whom, were I even to detect them in their lurking-holes, I should hardly waste a penful of ink. Let them continue to throw their impotent darts, and scatter their innocent firebrands, as long as they please. I shall imitate an emperor, who, when he was told that the rabble had thrown dirt at his statue, rubbed his face, and said: “I feel it not.”—The toothless cur may bark, and bark; but cannot inflict a deadly bite: the lash of Jerom would be ill employed against such a harmless animal.

I LOOKED for criticism, I courted it: but I expected, vainly expected, that my critics would be liberal critics; would be gentlemen and scholars; scholars well versed in Oriental learning, and perfectly acquainted with the subject of their critique. I expected that they would contrast my version with the originals, and compare it with other translations; point out where I had failed, and where I had succeeded; shown, if they could show, that I had either misunderstood or misinterpreted my author; produced examples from every species of Hebrew composition; and overturned my reasonings by logical argumentation: how was I disappointed to find nothing in their strictures, but vague declamation and general invective! May they rest in peace!

To my patient subscribers an apology is due, for the too tardy appearance of this volume. Many things have contributed to this delay, which has given more pain to myself, than disappointment to them. To enumerate the causes may be unnecessary: as I trust they will no more occur. Measures are taking to make the future volumes succeed one another, with as much dispatch as the nature of the work will allow. The third volume of Translation and the second volume of Critical Remarks will, it is hoped, come out together in the course of next year.

I AM sorry to be obliged to raise the price of the volumes: but the rise of the price of paper has been so great, that this was absolutely unavoidable. After all, I am told by my Booksellers, that the price is too small; and considering the quantity of matter and the beauty of the page, it ought to have been two guineas.

guineas. Even at that price I am certain I should not have pocketed a single guinea: as it is, the profits will be less than nothing; unless a greater number be sold than I expect. But my motive in writing was not to enrich myself; but, if possible, to enlighten my fellow creatures; and to eradicate their prejudices.—Even those who will not be enlightened, nor quit their prejudices, ought to be thankful for the service I have done—by illustrating many obscure passages in the Hebrew writings, and giving a more faithful version of them, I presume, than has yet appeared in English. Without adopting my ideas of *inspiration*, *infallibility*, &c. they may profit of my labour; and, while they dislike my principles, applaud my perseverance.

For the sake of such conscientious persons it has been proposed, that I should give a small edition of the Translation alone; with as few explanatory notes as possible: and to this I have no objection but one—namely, that, without a pretty copious subscription, I could not undertake so expensive a secondary work. Five hundred names at least would be necessary; with some small advance for each volume. The first two volumes might be put to the press immediately, and the rest printed at the same time with the larger work. The Old Testament might be comprised in *five*, and the New Testament in two volumes. The price of each volume could not be less than half-a-guinea. If these proposals be acceded to; a neat edition in twelves shall keep pace with that in quarto; and be finished at the same time.

AND now I conclude this short Preface in the words of Manzotti:

*Tu, liber, interea, diversa per oppida curre,
Invidiam subituro gravem: nam nullus ubique
Oblatrator erit, cujus lacerabere morsu.
Non deerunt certè, qui cum nil edere possint
Dignum laude, tamen gaudent maledicere semper;
Carpentis aliis famam venantur inanem.
Hos tu lividulos catulos orisque maligni
Exosus, refuge; et doctos inquire bonosque;
Qui pauci sunt—sed paucis potes esse beatus.*

FAREWELL.

CRITICAL REMARKS.

GENESIS. CHAP. I.

Ver. 1. *IN the beginning* בְּרֵאשִׁית. This word, on which so much has been written, can refer only to one or other of two periods; either, proleptically, to the six days creation, or to some prior epoch. Those who refer it to a prior epoch, render *Originally*. So the late Bishop Law, in his manuscript Notes; and so some German interpreters of the present day. Nay, the Chaldee paraphrast Jonathan seems to have taken it in that sense: for he renders it אֶתְּחִלָּה *a principio*.

I would rather refer it to what follows; and if I were to paraphrase the verse, I would do it thus: "The first thing which God did, to make earth a suitable habitation for man, was to give to it and to the heavens the reciprocal appearances which they now have. Before that period, the earth was immersed in water, and covered with thick darkness, &c. and with respect to *it*, the *heavens* existed not; that is, all those ethereal phenomena, which constitute what we call *the heavens*, were yet invisible."—Such a change, or revolution, might justly and properly be denominated a *Creation*: for the word בָּרָא, which we render *created*, has been, without reason, considered as implying an absolute creation-out of nothing; as will be shown in the next Remark but one.

It is hardly worth remarking, that Aquila translates the Hebrew word בְּרֵאשִׁית by a Greek word, which, according to Basil and Ambrose, denotes rather the simultaneousness than the time of the operation; as if he had meant to say, "God all at once, or, in a summary manner, *ἐν κεφαλῇ* (or *κεφαλῇ*) created, &c."—Aquila, most probably, dreamed of no such refinement; but only adopted, according to his servile mode of translating, a Greek term, which seemed to correspond more literally with the Hebrew, than *ἀρχῇ*, which the more antient translators had used, and which was retained by Theodotion and Symmachus.—He may, however, have had in his view a passage in Ecclesiasticus xviii. 1. Ὁ ζῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκτίσεν τὰ πάντα κοινῇ; which our translators render: "He that liveth for ever, created all things *IN GENERAL*." But see c. 2. on that place.

Ib. *God* עֲלִיּוֹן. After reading much, and thinking more, on this Hebrew word, I confess I am not entirely satisfied with any etymon that has yet presented itself. In my explanatory Note, I have said that, in its primitive signification, it denotes *strength, power*, *ισχυρος* the *mighty one*: nor have I yet seen any very cogent reason to depart from this most antient and most generally received derivation. It is so natural to affix the idea of superior power to the Deity, that it could hardly miss entering into some one of his appellations. But let us try to analyse the term.

The most simple form in which the Hebrew name of God appears is אֱל; and this has been supposed by lexicographers to be the same with אֱל, which unquestionably signifies *strong, powerful*.—To this derivation, however, Michaelis formally objects, and even calls it a manifest blunder. His chief reason is, the difference of orthography; namely that, when the word signifies God it is uniformly written אֱל without a *jod*; but never so, when it signifies strong. But this, I think, is a rash assumption. From the collation of manuscripts it is clear that the Jewish scribes did not always observe that rule. In Exod. 15. 11. where the printed Text, both in the SAM. and HEB. copies, has אֱלִים, 6 SAM. and 2 HEB. MSS. have אֱלִי. On the other hand, in v. 15 of the same ch. where the Text has אֱלִי, 8 MSS. have אֱלִי. In Ezek. 17. 13. the Text has אֱלִי, and 2 MSS. have אֱלִי; but in ch. 32. 21. where the Text has אֱלִי, 23 MSS. have אֱלִי.

From this I think it is sufficiently clear, that the Hebrew scribes were apt to write the word both ways, especially after the vowel-points came into general use: for then the *matres lectionis*, i. e. the real original vowels, were often dropped; more especially the *vau* and *jod*: a *bolem*, *šurek* or *kibutz* supplying the place of the former; and a *šferê* or *birik-katon* that of the latter.—Thus, with respect to *jod*, we find וַיִּקַּח and וַיִּקַּח, וַיִּקַּח and וַיִּקַּח, וַיִּקַּח and וַיִּקַּח, וַיִּקַּח and וַיִּקַּח, וַיִּקַּח and וַיִּקַּח.—A most striking instance occurs in the word קָרָא. In Gen. 37. 24. the SAM. printed Text has the word full; but the HEB. with 5 SAM. MSS. have it defective. In Deut. 32. 4. both printed Texts have קָרָא, but 4 SAM. MSS. have קָרָא. In Nehem. 5. 13. the Text has קָרָא, but 4 MSS. have קָרָא.

These examples I have brought to prove that the Masoretic copyists, in writing words which have a *jod* in the middle, were by no means scrupulous about retaining or rejecting that genuine vowel, since they had a spurious vowel point to substitute in its room. There is then, in my apprehension, no sufficient proof that אֱל and אֱל were not originally the same word; and, consequently, our Glossarists, who derive אֱלִים from אֱל, are not so much in the wrong as Michaelis would make us believe.—His objection drawn from the points is, with me, of no force; and indeed he lays little stress on it. Besides, the punctuation itself varies: for we find אֱל pointed in all the following forms, אֱלִי, אֱלִי and אֱלִי, which last is the punctuation of אֱל God.

But whence is it, then, says Michaelis, that the word is uniformly written and pointed אֱל, when it signifies God, and אֱל with the same, or other, points, when it denotes *power, strength*?—I answer, first, The uniformity is not so certain, as we have just now seen. Secondly, supposing that uniformity, might not the first inventors of vowel-points, or the improvers on that invention, have purposely made such a distinction? as they are supposed to have made a similar one to distinguish אֱל a *vapour*, from אֱל a *calamity*: although here, too, there is the same confusion in different copies. For in the only two places, where the word is supposed to signify a *vapour*, namely, Gen. 2. 6. and Job 36. 7. three MSS. in the former place, and fifty in the latter, have אֱל. On the other hand, where it means *calamity*, which is thirty-two times, only in seven of these places is it without the various reading אֱל.

I repeat it then, there is no solid proof that אֱל and אֱל were not originally the same word.—But how is אֱלִים derived from that word? This is another question, which next comes to be discussed. In order to which, it is first of all to be observed, that the word אֱלִים is here

in its plural form, the singular of which is **אלה**. Now how is this **אלה** derived from **אל**?—Three schemes of derivation have chiefly attracted my attention.

The first of these is, to make it a compound of **אל** and **נתי** *Potens-ille*; or, as we would say, *The mighty He*, κατ' ἐξοχήν. What seems in some measure to confirm this etymon is, that in Ps. 102. 28. God is designed without any other epithet **אלההוה** and **THOU-HE**: which the Greek translator renders **συ δε ὁ αὐτός**; and our common Version: "But thou art the same."—Hence among the *Kabulists* **נתי** is accounted one of the names of God. See Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. and Castell. Lex. Polyglott.*

It may, indeed, be objected, that to justify this etymon the pronoun **נתי** should be written **נה**—Perhaps so it was originally; but in process of time changed into **נתי** to distinguish it from the verb. It is well known that the letters **נ** and **ה** have often been interchanged, even without any change in the meaning. Neither the Syriac nor the Arabic have **נ** at all in their respective pronouns, but either **ה**, or **י** single; which form the Chaldee sometimes puts on: and in Hebrew the equivalent suffix is only **י** as the equivalent prefix is only **ה**.—Besides, it was not necessary, nor even usual, in compounding words, to take in all the letters of each component part: more especially in proper names. See Simonis's *Onomasticon*.

A second derivation, that would remove even the fore-mentioned objection, and which is not without plausibility, is to compound it of **אל** and **נתי** *Potens-ens*, the *powerful being*; an appellation, which every one must allow to be perfectly suitable.

A third derivation is that of the learned Jew Abarbanel, latterly supported and illustrated by David Levi, in the first volume of his *Lingua Sacra*.—According to them, both **אלהים** and **אלה** are singulars, and compounded of **אל** and two letters taken from the sacred name **יהוה**: but the borrowed letters are not the same for both forms: **אלה** borrows **י** and **ה**, but **אלהים** and its constructive form **אלהי** borrow **ה** and **י**†.

This is ingenious enough; but I fear it will not bear the test of a severe rational critique.—For, in the first place, admitting this strange mangling and dismembering of the sacred name **יהוה**, how came the profane letter **ס** to be tacked to the word? Oh! says Mr. Levi, the final **ס** is joined "to form the *absolute*, **אלהים**, by which it is distinguished from its *relative* **אלהי**."—Can he produce such another instance from the whole body of Hebrew scriptures?

Granting then, that the termination **ים** is not always a proof that the word is a plural, (or, to speak more properly, that a plural form may express only a single person or people, as **אפריים**, **מנחם**) this cannot be granted with regard to **אלהים**; which has not only every external mark and requisite of a genuine plural; but must evidently be rendered so, both in *absolute* and *relative* construction, as often as it signifies more gods than one, or more than one great personage—Who then is authorised to make a grammatical distinction between **אלהים** when it denotes the true God, and **אלהים** when it denotes false gods? And is it not better to say,

* I cannot but here notice a mistake in Castell. He says, that in the Arabic Version of Ps. 99. 2. the Hebrew word **אל** is rendered **הו** *Ille*. But the Hebrew word is not **אל** but **יהוה**, and this is rendered not **הו** but **אלה**. See c. 2. on that place.

† For this the author gives mystical reasons, which I take no notice of: because in biblical criticism I admit none. The curious reader, who chooses to see them, may peruse the long article **אלה** in the above mentioned volume.

with Aben-Ezrah and the run of Jewish commentators, that the plural, when applied to the one true God, is used "for honour's sake, על דרך הכבוד, according to the idiom of the language, מדרך הלשון;" and this I take to be the real case. See the conclusion of this Remark.

In the second place, Abarbanel's etymon lies under another very great objection. If אלה and אלהים comprehend in themselves both אל and יהוה God and *JEHOVAH*; such phrases as יהוה אלהים and אלהים יהוה, the former of which frequently occurs, are mere tautologies.

"But (says Mr. Levi) if אלה, אלה, and אלהים be all of the same root and signification, what is the reason of the change, in the order that they are written; that is, אלהים and אלה being always written without a *vau*, and אלה always with one?" Why, in my opinion it has arisen from the mere caprice of orthographers, who have, in all ages and languages, made gradual alterations and real or pretended improvements in the manner of writing words, as well as of constructing phrases. To instance only in our own language; what changes has not orthography undergone since the days of Elizabeth? How many letters which were deemed useful or superfluous, have we not expunged? And no letter has been more frequently so, than the very letter that corresponds with the Hebrew *vau*, which has, by degrees, almost totally disappeared from the numerous class of words that terminate in *our*.

But to return to אלה, Mr. Levi allows that it is once at least written without the *vau*, Deut. 32. 17. He should have added Dan. 11. 38. and Habakuk 1. 11. I mean according to the common Text: for many mss. in Dan. and one at least in Hab. have the word full. Such is the diversity and mutability of Hebrew orthography.—For the exception in Deut. Mr. Levi has at hand a mystical reason; namely, because there it is applied to false gods: but is it not so also in 2 Chron. 32. 15? Yet there the word is written full, with the exception of a single ms.: which ms., according to Mr. Levi's mysticism, must be supposed to be the genuine reading.

The truth is, the singular of אלהים is rarely found in the Hebrew Scriptures, except in poetical compositions. In the whole Pentateuch it occurs but twice; and that in the Song of Moses, Deut. 32. 15, 17. In the former of these verses it is in the printed Text written full, but defective in 5 mss. In the latter verse the Text has it defective, but 23 mss. have it full. In both places the SAM. Text hath אלה, without any variety of lection.—In the book of Job it occurs about forty times; and in sixteen of these, there is a variety of reading either of one or of two mss.—In the Psalms it occurs, I think, but four times, and in each of these one or two mss. have אלה.

Be these mss. faulty or not, it is all one to me. I bring the examples only to shew how vague and uncertain is Hebrew orthography, with respect to the original vowels; owing chiefly to the substitution of vowel-points. For, let it be remarked, that in all those instances the Masoretes direct us to read the word in the same manner, by thrusting in a *holem* between the ל and the ה in the defective אלה; a plain proof of their being convinced that the *vau* originally belonged to it.

Come we now to אלה, the relative form of אלהים. Mr. Levi grants, that, in the Psalms, it is twice found with a *vau*; namely, Pf. 143. 10. and 145. 1. He might have added Pf. 18. 47. where the Text of Athias has אלהי עמי.

I have

I have neither time nor inclination to look for the mystical "causes of this deviation from a general rule, according to the order of the Masora;" nor shall I avail myself of that deviation to combat Mr. Levi's system: I will even lend him my aid, if he choose it, to get rid of the anomaly: for, in the first example 42 mss. in the second 52, and in the third not less than 59, have the *defective* מֵלֶךְ.—Granting then, what is not strictly true, that both מֵלֶךְ and מְלֶכֶךְ are uniformly and invariably written without a *vau*, and מֵלֶכֶךְ as uniformly with one; I can readily account for it, without having recourse to the Masora, or the mystical reasons of Mr. Levi.

It is extremely common with the Hebrew scribes to eliminate from plurals that letter, when it occurs in the middle of a word; as the reader may convince himself by turning to the participial forms בָּנָה, נָלַח, חָזַח, חָלַח, שָׂדַח, נָשַׁח, עָלַח, עָשַׁח, פָּעַח, רָמַח, רָעַח, שָׁנַח.—To particularize in a few instances: The word חָזַח a *feet*, is in the singular written sometimes with, and sometimes without the *vau*; but its plural חָזְזָה always without it. So, we find רָמַח and רָמַח, but never רָמַח nor רָמַח. So שָׁנַח and שָׁנַח, but never שָׁנַח nor שָׁנַח. In Buxtorf's Concordance, indeed, we find שָׁנַח, and are referred to Levit. 26. 17. But this is a mistake; for the Text of Athias has the word *defective*; nor is there any variety of reading in either Kennicott or De Rossi. The word מְנוּחָה is never, I think, in the singular written without the *vau*; in the plural never with it. I know the vowel-points are changed, and vary: but that is nothing to the purpose; still the *vau* has been eliminated.—The word מְנוּחָה is never written without the *vau*, but its plural מְנוּחָה never with the *vau*: yet this too is one of the names of God.

In all these words, as well as in מְנוּחָה, the *vau* is what grammarians call a *servile* letter. I will now bring examples of elision of the same letter, even from the plurals of words in which it is *radical*.—The word יוֹם a *day* occurs in the singular above 1300 times, but never once, I believe, without the *vau*: whereas its plurals יוֹמִים and יוֹמִי, which occur at least 800 times, are always *defective*. The vowel-point is changed: but that, as I have observed on another occasion, makes nothing against my argument; still the radical *vau* is eliminated.—In like manner, we have דָּר and sometimes דָּר in the singular; and twice דָּרִים; but we never once find דָּרִים; although that plural form occurs at least forty times.—So תֹּר a *turtle dove*, which in the singular is sometimes written תֹּר; but never תֹּרִים in the plural.

Not only the letter *vau*, but also the letter *jod*, has met with a similar fate. The word עָר a *town*, which so very frequently occurs, is in the singular never written *defective*; but in the plural scarcely ever *full*.—So בֵּית has בָּתִּים, בָּתִּים, &c.—In short, such was the propensity of the Hebrew orthographists to thrust out those two vowels, that they made no scruple of ejecting them even from singulars, as well as plurals, just as it suited their fancy, or tickled their ear; supplying their place, either by a vowel-point of the same power, or one which they deemed more harmonious, or which perhaps a vicious pronunciation had introduced: as frequently happens in all languages.—The very lengthening of a word by the addition of a letter was deemed a sufficient cause of elision. We have a singular instance in the word אִישׁ a *man*; which never once occurs *defective*: but its feminine אִשָּׁה a *woman* is never once written *full*, that is, with a *jod* after *aleph*. So אִוֵּל a *fool*, is in the singular not once written without the *jod*. But let it be lengthened by the addition of the letters ו or ת, it becomes אִוֵּלִי and אִוֵּלִית.

If any one, yet unconvinced, have a further desire to see how vaguely variable, and unconfin'd to rule, is Hebrew orthography, let him take the trouble, with me, to observe the whole diversity that appears in the single word גדול *great*.—This word, in its most simple singular form, without *prefix* or *affix*, occurs about 170 times, and is only twice written defective, Deut. 26. 8. and Ps. 57. 11. and, in the former of these places, the SAM. Text, and 29 HEB. MSS. read *full*: in the latter 57 MSS. have the word likewise *full*; so that, on the whole, גדול may be said to be the absolute, invariable reading. But when the same word is lengthened by the prefix ה, which is about ninety-nine times, the *vau* is wanting in sixteen places; and all these are in the Pentateuch. It is true that even in these the SAM. uniformly, and in most of them many HEB. MSS. have והגדול; and this, I doubt not, is the genuine original reading: but I am now speaking of the strange variety in our present, pretendedly *pure* and *immaculate*, Text.—With the prefixes ב and ו there is no *defective* example; and only one with each of the prefixes כ* and מ; and in the last instance the word is still more lengthened by the prefix *lamed*. It occurs in Esther 1. 5. and although it be given *defective* in Buxtorf's Concordance †, it is, in the Text of Athias and of Bomberg, written *full*.

In the plural forms of גדול we meet with גדולים only eleven times, but with גדלים twenty-four times; the conjunctive form גדלי occurs but thrice, and only once *full*.

The foregoing examples are all in the masculine.—The feminine גדולה, either with or without any *prefix*, occurs ninety-two times *full*, and twenty-eight times defective ‡: but its plural גדולות, which occurs thirty-eight times, is never *full* but once in Buxtorf; namely, Josh. 24. 17. and even there the Text of Athias has it *defective*.—It may here be worth remarking that this same plural, like other plurals of a like form, is not unfrequently written doubly defective; that is, without a *vau* at all, גדולת; two officious *bolems* supplying both defects.—Such was the propensity of the Jewish scribes to eject the letter *vau*, that even the short negative ולא, which occurs so very often, is, if we may trust Bythner, found written *full* only thirty-five times in the whole Hebrew Scripture.

I have dwelled so long upon this subject, not so much for the purpose of contesting Abarbanel's and Mr. Levi's derivation of the word אלהים; as to shew the biblical student, how little stress, in general, is to be laid on derivations and combinations, grounded upon the omission or non-omission of a letter; and, at the same time, to point out the absurdity of mystical Kabbalism.—Were a Christian Kabbalist (and such things are) to analyse the name JESUS, or יֵשׁוּעַ, after the same manner and with the same latitude, and find in it JEHOVAH-THE-SAVIOUR, I believe there is not a Jew who would not sneer at the conceit. Mr. Levi then will pardon us, if we smile at his mystical derivation of אלהים; and deem not, with him, the variety in writing the word “the effect of superlative wisdom.”

A fourth compound derivation, which I shall just notice, is that of those who compose it of אל and אחד *The tremendous great one*: which, certainly, is no unsuitable epithet, and coincides

* But here, also, the SAM. and 27 MSS. have the word *full*.

† In Buxtorf there are numerous mistakes of this sort; and a new Hebrew Concordance is much wanted: but to make a good one would require much time and labour; with great critical abilities.

‡ Henceforward, I follow Buxtorf, without verifying the examples on the Text of Athias, or comparing it with the various readings: which are no doubt to be found in almost every instance.

with the idea of a Latin poet; *Primus in orbe deos fecit timor*—and if the Latin *Deus* be derived from the Greek *Δεός*, as some etymologists have imagined, and not from *Θεός* *; it would give probability to that idea. But since *אלהים*, as has been already said, is evidently in a plural form, this derivation labours under the same difficulty as the former one.

Still more inadmissible are that of Rabbi Nahman (נחמן) who makes it a compound of *אל* and *ה*, *Their-God*; and that of some moderns, who would have it to be a compound of *אל* and *ים*, *The-god of the waters*.—So I now proceed to the second mode of derivation; according to which *אלה* is not a compound, but a pure derivative. And here, again, the learned are divided.

Hutchinson, and the whole Hutchinsonian school, derive it from *אלה* to *swear*, to *curse*: and hence, according to them, *אלה*, in the singular, means *The accursed one*, i. e. Jesus the second person of the Trinity, who was accursed for the sins of men: but the plural *אלהים* denotes “the *Denouncers of a conditional curse*, (says Parkhurst) usually given in Hebrew Scriptures to the ever blessed Trinity: by which they represent themselves as under the obligation “of an *oath* to perform certain conditions; and as having denounced a *curse* upon all men “and devils, who do not conform to them.”—If any critic be contented with this etymon and this interpretation, he may adopt them: to me both appear fanciful and absurd.

For, in the first place, it is taken for granted, that *אלה* God, is derived from *אלה* to *swear*; whereas it is much more probable that *אלה* is itself a denominative verb from *אל*, signifying to *adjure by God*: as we might say of an habitual swearer, he *by-gods* it, at every other word.—This, I am fully convinced, is the true derivation of the verb *אלה*.

In the next place, the Hutchinsonians fondly suppose that the plurals *אלהים* and *אלה* denote the three persons of “the ever blessed Trinity:” as wild a supposition, in my conception, as ever was supposed. What! doth a term, which is equally applied to *Beel-zebub* the god of Ekron, to *Chamos* the god of Moab, to *Moloch* the god of the Ammonites; to the gods of Hamath, Arphad, Sepharvaim, Ena and Ava, denote the *ever blessed Trinity*? Yet to all these obscene deities the word *אלהים* is applied by the Hebrew writers: a profanation hardly possible, if they believed that the term itself contained the most profound sacred mysteries; or indeed any property or attribute peculiar to their own God *Ἰεσοῦς*; which latter term they never apply to any other god.

Again, if *אלהים* signify the three persons of the God-head, how are we to explain, in the Hutchinsonian system, *רוח אלהים* the *Spirit of God*? Why truly we must say that he is the spirit of himself! in as much as he is supposed to be one of the persons of that Trinity!—If the doctrine of a Trinity stand not on a firmer foundation than this, it will not certainly bear a rude shake.

Others, and, according to Michaelis, with a much greater degree of verisimilitude, derive it from the Arabic *أله*, or rather *أله*, *astonitus fuit, obstupuit, &c.* But this epithet is more suitable to the *worshipper* than to the *worshipped*. Even if the verb could bear an active signification, *stupescit* instead of *obstupuit*, the *vau*, I apprehend, in the word *אלה* must change its place, in order to effect a regular derivation.

* That this however is the true derivation I have no doubt.

Were I to derive **אלה** from any single root, it would be from the Arabic **ألى**, which denotes *beneficence, bounty, &c.* the most amiable attribute of the Deity; and from which we and all the Gothic tribes have denominated the supreme being, **Gods**.—In this supposition, I should be inclined to think, that the *vau* is an interloper; and that the Samaritan reading, in the Pentateuch, is the true original reading. This is the more probable, as the Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic have all **אלה**; which, when pointed, takes a *kamets*, and not a *bolem*, after *lamed*; and so, likewise, in their respective plurals **אלהם** and **אלהיה**. In this case, I should call **אל** not the *root*, but the abbreviation of **אלה** and **אלהים**, as **יה** is evidently the abbreviation of **יהוה**.—I balance, therefore, between this ctymon and the first compound one, and am at a loss which to prefer.

One query, partly grammatical, still remains unanswered. Do the plural forms **אלהם** and **אלוה** denote a plurality of persons, when applied to the One true God?—No; not any more than **אדונים** and **אדוני** denote a plurality of *Lords*, **בוראים** and **בוראי** a plurality of *Creators*, **פנים** and **פני** a plurality of *faces*, or **חיים** a plurality of *lives*.—It is truly strange that such a notion should ever have been entertained: and indeed it is only a modern notion, of the same age with scholastic theology. The Christian Fathers of the Church, who were eager enough to discover in the Old Testament proofs of a Trinity, never dreamed of seeking one in **אלהם** *. Hear Jerom on the word: “Scire autem debemus, quod **אלהים** communis numeri sit; et “quod unus Deus sic vocetur, et plures: ad quam similitudinem *cali* quoque appellantur et “*calum*; id est **SAMAIM** (unde et sæpe interpretes variant)—Cujus rei exemplum nos in “lingua nostra habere possumus: *Athenas, Thebas, Salonas*.” Ep. ad Marcellam, vol. 2. p. 705. ed. Bened. It has been already remarked, that the term **אלהים** is applied not only to the true God, but to false gods; and even to a single false god, whether male or female, such as *Baal, Dagon, Ashtaroah, &c.* It is applied to one angel in Jud. 13. 22. and to one man, Moses, Exod. 4. 16. and 7. 1. Nay, the golden calf is called, by Aaron himself, **אלוהי** gods of gold. The plural number then is no proof of a Trinity of Gods, or Persons: and this is, indeed, allowed by the best commentators, whether Catholic or Protestant. See Drusius's Dissertation on the word **אלהים** in the second volume of the Sacred Critics, part 2. p. 298.

For the rest, the application of the term to great men, as well as to God, was not peculiar to the Hebrews: the Greek **θεός**, and the Latin **deus** and **divus**, had often the like appropriations: particularly among the poets.—So natural is it for men in high stations to *receive*, and men in low stations to *give*, epithets and appellations that belong only to the great Supreme Being.

How the plural number **אלהים** came to be in such general use among the Hebrews, even when it denotes the one true God, may perhaps be thus rationally accounted for: Before the vocation of Abraham, polytheism seems generally to have prevailed: the gods, therefore, would be a general term. The error, in worship, was rectified by the Hebrew legislator: but stubborn language has seldom been known to bend even to legislative power; and a term, once

* Calmet, indeed, quotes Origen, Jerom and Epiphanius; but these good fathers draw their proofs of a Trinity, not from **אלהים**, but from the word **נעשה** *let us make*. Gen. 1. 26.

become idiomatical, is not easily dislodged. Thus אלהים, we may suppose, obstinately kept its place in the Hebrew or rather Phœnician dialect : although its meaning was generally restricted to one God, by putting the concurring verb or adjective in the singular number. Every language hath some such peculiarities. The Greeks, even the polite Athenians, could say and write Ζῶα τρέχει The animals runs. Δι' ὀμίλης τα σπώματα μέγαν φαίνεται, Bodies appears greater through a cloud. The correct and elegant Plato could say Ἔστιν ἰπῶς There is some ; just as the French scruple not to say, *Il est des hommes—Il est des cas—*and *C'est vous, qui &c.* ; nor we, "It was the French who were the aggressors : " although, strictly speaking, all these phrases are real solecisms. And so is the word *means* with a singular verb or adjective : which however is still, in spite of Lowth's remonstrance, used even by polite speakers ; who never think of the impropriety.

Ib. *Created.* ברא. This word has, chiefly on the authority of Maimonides, been considered as implying what Theologians call *an absolute creation out of nothing*. I am firmly persuaded that it never has that meaning. It rather means to *fashion, form, and decorate* a matter already existing : and here, in particular, it means to retrieve from a state of desolation, and embellish this little spot of earth, to render it fit for its inhabitants.

In the same limited sense God is afterwards ch. 2. 7. said to have *created* man, not out of *nothing*, but out of the *dust* of the ground. Joshua 17. 15, 18, bids the children of Joseph *create* to themselves a more ample possession, by cutting down the woods. Goliath 1 Sam. 18. 8, desires the Israelites to *create*, that is, *choose* or *prepare*, a proper champion to fight with him. In Numb. 16. 30, 1 Kings 12. 33, and Nehem. 6. 8, it signifies to *devise* ; and so, in Kings, our translators render it : but in Numbers they render it *make*, and in Nehemiah *feign* : whereas *devise* would have been equally proper in all the three places *.—In short, the word ברא to me appeareth to have the same meaning, or rather to be the self-same word, with the Latin *PARO* † ; not, as Michaelis thought, with *pario* ; which is, I think, evidently derived from פרה to be fruitful.—It is, perhaps, worth remarking that, in the Scoto-Saxon dialect, the word ברא is still used in its original meaning, and is composed of the same letters BRA ; which signifies *adorned, decorated, newly-clad, &c.* ‡ The French *parer* is doubtless of the same family.

But is it hereby meant to be insinuated, that this unfashioned matter itself was not originally created out of nothing ? By no means : all that, as a philologist, I insist on, is, that the word ברא implies no such meaning : and, to speak my mind freely, it is my belief that the Hebrew cosmologist had no such idea. It is my belief that the more antient Jews held nearly the same opinion on this point, as the Pythagoricians and elder Platonists ; namely, that matter was co-eternal with God ; as the sun's rays are co-eval with the sun §.—Philo clearly expresses

* See the remark on ch. 2. ver. 3.

† Nay, the word is so rendered by Theodotion, *σπομασαι*. Ezech. 21. 19. and by the Chaldee Paraphrast *ܩܪܐ*. Josh. 17. 15.

‡ Be not surprised, good reader, at my finding Hebrew in the Scoto-Saxon dialect. I trust I shall, one day, be able to prove that almost all our genuine Saxon words are either Hebrew, Chaldee, Arabic or Persic.

§ Those who admit the eternal generation of the Logos (which they sometimes endeavour to elucidate by the same Platonic simile) cannot reasonably object to the Platonic doctrine of the eternal generation of matter.

himself after the Platonic manner : “ Moses, says he, knew that there must be, in the nature of things, one ACTIVE being, and another PASSIVE being : and that the ACTIVE is the most simple pure MIND of the universe, ὁ τῶν ὅλων NOTE εἰλακρνεσῆς καὶ ακραυνησῆς ; more excellent than virtue, more excellent than knowledge ; the supremely good, the supremely BEAUTIFUL : whereas the PASSIVE is inanimate, and, of its own nature, motionless : but, endowed, by MIND, with motion, form and animation, it becomes a perfect work ; that is, *this very world*, τὸν δὲ τὸν κόσμον.” Cosinop. vol. i. p. 5. nov. ed.

I have observed, in my Preface to the Pentateuch, that the author of the Book of Wisdom believed, that the almighty hand of God created the world out of unfashioned matter, ἐξ ἀμορφῆς ὕλης : and Justin Martyr, having in view this passage, says it was the Christian doctrine of his time, Πᾶντα, τὴν ἀρχὴν, ἀγαθὸν οὐτὰ δημιουργῆσαι αὐτὰν [Θεὸν] ἐξ ἀμορφῆς ὕλης διδασκόμεθα. Apol. 1. No. 10. ed. Ben. And in another place of the same Apology, No. 59, he affirms that the doctrine of Plato, with respect to the creation of the world, is the very doctrine of Moses, and from Moses borrowed. “ Ἵνα δὲ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων διδασκαλῶν λαβόντες τὸν Πλάτωνα μαθῆτε τὸ εἶπεν, ὕλην ἀμορφὴν σρεψαστα, κόσμον ποιεῖναι, ἀκούσατε τῶν αὐταλέξει εἰρημενοῦ δια Μωσέως. κ. τ. λ.”—Again, No. 67, he says : “ We assemble on Sunday ; both because it is the first day, in which God, changing *darkness and matter*, τὸ σκοτὸς καὶ τὴν ὕλην, made the world.”

The passage of Wisdom is also quoted by Origen ; but with this remark, that the Book is not by all received as canonical scripture. He adds however, that it was the more general opinion, that original matter is designated in the beginning of Genesis. “ Quamplurimi sane putant, rerum ipsam materiam significari in eo quod, in principio Genesis scriptum est a Moysē : *In principio creavit Deus cælum et terram : terra autem erat invisibilis et incomposita. Invisibilem namque et incompositam non aliud eis [al. effc] Moyses quam informem materiam visus est indicare.*” Peri Arch. l. iv. No. 33. Ex Versione Ruffini.

A passage in the second Book of Machabees has been opposed to that of the Book of Wisdom, and given, by those who believe the former to be canonical scripture, as a positive scriptural proof of a *creation out of nothing*. It is in ch. 7. 28, which, according to the Latin Vulgate, runs thus : “ Peto, nate, ut aspicias ad cælum et terram, et ad omnia quæ in eis sunt ; et intelligas, quia ex *NIHILO* fecit illa Deus.” Here, say they, it is plainly asserted that God made all things out of nothing ! It is so ; but this only shews, with what circumspection the Latin Vulgate, and indeed all translations, ought to be used in confirmation of any particular dogmatico-scholastic opinion : for, on the sole inspection of the Greek Text, the fallacy is discovered ; and the very language of the Platonists presents itself. The words are ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων [not μηδενος] which our English translators inaccurately, not to say absurdly, render “ of things that were not.” For how can things *be* things and *not be* things ?—But admitting the Platonic explanation, οὐκ ὄν or μη ὄν is nothing else than unfashioned matter ; and γενεσθαι τι ἐκ μη ὄντος is merely to become what it was not before ; that is, to be clothed in some *new, specific, stable form* *.

There is in Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 1. 28, a passage strongly illustrative

* See Mosheim's excellent Dissertation *De creatione mundi ex nihilo*.

of the true meaning of το μη ον. “Τα αγωγη του κοσμου και τα εξουθενημενα εξελεξατο ο Θεος, και τα ΜΗ ΟΝΤΑ, ινα τα ΟΝΤΑ καταργησιν;” the last comma of which our translators render: “and things which *are not*, to bring to nought things that *are* :” a version, which, if literally understood, is absurd: but in the language of the Platonists perfectly intelligible, and consonant with the preceding member. Τα μη οντα could not, in the meaning of the Apostle, signify *nothing* in opposition to *something*; but merely *things* and *persons* comparatively of *no account*, in the eyes of the world: as we often say, catachrestically, “Such a one is *nothing* at all.”

On the whole, two things, I presume, have been clearly shewn; 1st, That it was a current opinion among the antient Jews, and earliest Christians, that the world was created, by God, of pre-existing unfashioned matter. How long that matter had existed before the six days creation, is a question in which I am not, at present, concerned; nor will I ever wrangle with any one about matters of mere opinion.—2dly, That the word ברא nowhere signifies to *create out of nothing*: nay, nor any other word by which it has been rendered; such as خلق in Arabic, שלם in Samaritan, משר in Persic*, ποιεω in Greek, *create* in Latin: nor can I find, that any single word in any language, with which I am acquainted, ever meant a *creation out of nothing*. Indeed, if it did, what need were there of adding *out of nothing* to complete its signification?

From all that has been here said, it is then highly probable at least, that the first verse of Genesis is to be referred, not to a prior epoch, but to the operations that follow; and that the words of Genesis are equivalent to “When God, in the beginning, created those heavens and “this earth”—or perhaps better still; “Before God created,” &c.—This being pre-supposed to be the real meaning, we have in the six days creation a consistent, harmonious plan, well imagined, and beautifully pourtrayed; as will more evidently appear, in our progress through the narrative.

Ib. *The Heavens.* שמים—Here is another plural, which might be, and is often, rendered in the singular: but, as our language admits both forms, I have throughout preferred the plural. Indeed, our vernacular *heaven* and *heavens* are the natural progeny of the Chaldee form; שמים *shamin* or *shemin*; changed first, by a very common aphæresis, into *bemin*; next into *bevin*; and lastly into *heaven*. Our sister dialects retain the *m*; but change the final *n* into *l*: and write *bimanel*, *hemamel*, or *hemel*. In Gothic it is *bimmins*.—In like manner, our word *earth* is the identical Hebrew word ארץ, which is derived from an Arabic root, that signifies *low*, as שמים is from another Arabic root, that denoteth *high*: and thus they are characterised in the Decalogue: “The heavens *above*, and the earth *below*.”

Verse 2. *The earth was yet a desolate waste.* Dathé and some others, who refer the first verse to a prior creation, render the second verse thus: “The earth had *afterwards* become a “desolate waste,” &c. I have preferred a term, which, although it readily accords with this hypothesis, excludes not decisively any other. The words תוהו and בורו, which I render a *desolate waste*, present, in all the few passages where they occur †, the idea of *dreary and dismal desolation*. *Inanity* and *vacuity* seem to be but accessory and secondary acceptations. Yet

* Syr. and Chald. retain the Hebrew word.

† See Deut. 32. 10. Job 12. 24. Ps. 108. 40. Jerem. 4. 23.

Aquila and Theodotion render them by the Greek words *κενῶν καὶ ὕδατος*—*κενῶν καὶ ὕδατος*: whence Jerom seems to have partly borrowed his *inanis et vacua*. What the more antient Greek translators saw in them, when they rendered them by *αερῶν καὶ σκοτεινῶν*, *invisible and unfurnished*; or Saadias, when he rendered *מְסֻבָּחַת מְסֻבָּחַת* *immersed in deep sea*; it is hard to say. They both seem to have guessed at some indistinct general meaning, that should not be unsuitable to the context*. For such, in fact, was the then actual situation of the earth; as is most beautifully expressed in the 104th Psalm, ver. 6.: “With the sea thou hadst covered it, as with a mantle: the waters were raised above the mountains:” which passage, as Dathe well observes, greatly favours the hypothesis of a pre-existing earth in a state of desolation.

Ib. *With darkness upon the face of the deep*. This greatly heightens the gloominess of the scene. The word *תְּהוֹמֹת* which we render darkness does not necessarily imply an absolute exclusion of all light; but that sort of caliginous darkness which the absence of the sun and a very dense cloudy atmosphere produce.—The earth was covered with deep water, and that water was covered with a thick darkness.

Ib. *And a mighty wind oversweeping, &c.* That the words *רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים* can have no other meaning, to me seems clear from the following circumstances: First, they cannot, without violence to grammar, be disjoined from ver. 2; and consequently appertain to the description of the state of the earth before the six days creation. Secondly, it is hard to say how the spirit of God, as a creating spirit, should here be introduced: which evidently diminisheth the force and beauty of ver. 3, so justly admired by Longinus as an example of the sublime; and so ably defended by Boileau against the cavils of Huet and Le Clerc. Thirdly, not only Onkelos and Jonathan, but both the Arabs and the Persic agree in understanding *רוּחַ* of a wind: nay, all the other antient translators ought, I conceive, to be so understood; as the terms which they employ in rendering it *רוּחַ* Syriac, *πνεῦμα* Greek, *spiritus* Latin, more properly denote *air, breath, wind*, than what we commonly call *spirit*; this latter being only a secondary and metaphorical acceptation. The Greek word is derived from *πνέω* to breathe or blow: hence Aristotle says, “the wind is nothing else than a quantity of thickened fluctuating air; which is also called *spirit*, *πνεῦμα*: although in another sense *spirit*, *πνεῦμα*, is used to denominate that animated and generative substance that exists in plants and animals,” *Ανεμος οὐδὲν ἐστὶν πλην Αἵματος πολλοῦ ῥεοντος καὶ αἰθέρος, ὅστις αἷμα καὶ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ λεγέται. Λεγέται δὲ καὶ ἕτερος πνεῦμα ἢ ἐν φυτοῖς καὶ ζώων ἐμφύτης τε καὶ γονιμὸς οὐσία*.—So the Latin *spiritus* from *spiro*, in its original and literal signification, denotes *breath, air*. Cicero, “*ARE, spiritu ductus, alit animantes*.” All its other significations are tralatitious.

Nothing was more natural than for the Hebrews, whose language was so poor in abstract definite terms, to call a great wind the *breath of God*, as they called *thunder* his voice, the clouds his habitation, his chariot; the lightnings and winds his ministers and messengers, &c. Thus Moses in the beautiful song after the passage of the Red Sea נִשְׁמַת בְּרוּחְךָ “With thy breath

* With regard to the other versions, the Syr. and both Thargums retain the Hebrew words: Onkelos, the Erpenian Arab and the Persic correspond with my translation.

"thou blowedst : the sea overwhelmed them." Exod. 15. 10.* And the Psalmist, describing a sudden thaw, says, "שֶׁב רִחוּ יָמָיו He changeth his spirit : [wind] the waters flow." Ps. 147. 18. So Isaiah 40. 7. "The grass withereth ! the flower fadeth ! because the spirit of the Lord bloweth upon them."—The literal signification then of רִיחַ is *air, wind, breath* : and רִיחַ אֱלֹהִים is literally *the breath of God*, that is, a great wind. In a metaphorical sense, the same words mean any divine *influence, impulse, inspiration* : and these are the only two meanings they have in the Hebrew scriptures.—Those who have found in the רִיחַ אֱלֹהִים of Genesis the *person* of the HOLY GHOST, have been very little versed in the language of the East ; and paid very little attention to the construction of the Text. Every thing in that construction determines the words to belong to what goes before. Had the writer meant to couple it with a new period, he would have written רִיחָהּ, not מִרִיחָהּ ; and, indeed, the antient Syriac, Chaldaic, Greek, and Latin translators seem to have been aware of this ; as they render, either participially with the original מִרִיחָהּ, מְנַשְׁמָה, or in the imperfect tense *ερεφετο ἢ, ferebatur* : which are equivalent to the participle מִרִיחָהּ.—With respect to the word itself, it is hard to determine its proper and precise meaning. It occurs but thrice, in any form, in the Hebrew scriptures ; namely here, Deut. 32. 11, and Jeremiah 23. 9, nor is much light to be obtained from the sister dialects. In Deut. the meaning is in some measure determined by the context ; and I have, with little hesitation, rendered it *bovereth* †. In Jeremiah, likewise, we are helped to the proper signification, by the simile that accompanies it : "My bones *shake* : I am like a drunken man," &c. Combining both these significations, we may form some idea of the word here connected with wind : yet it is not easy to find an English word to express that meaning. Onkelos, both Arabs, and the Samaritan version have words corresponding to our *blowing* or *blustering* ; and I had once rendered by this last term. I have now changed it into *oversweeping* ; but, perhaps, *agitating* would be better.—At any rate, the earth, at this period, was, according to the Hebrew cosmologist, entirely covered with sea, a sea without shore ; and this sea was covered with a dense, dark, tempestuous atmosphere which made the whole terraqueous globe invisible ; when the Almighty Creator, resolving to retrieve it from that dismal state, said,

Ver. 3. *Let there be light : and there was light.* The original יָד אֱלֹהִים יָדָהּ is more concise and emphatical. "Be light ; and light was." And this is the rendering of our first translator Wicliffe ; who uniformly in all similar phrases uses the simple imperative : *Be light* ||—*be a firmament—produce earth—make we man.* And, here, I cannot help wondering that our language has not yet got rid of that vile expletive *there*, than which I know none more useless or insignificant. For example, in the following : "*There* was a man in the land of Uz : " the

* So our Adric : "Thu sendest gaest thine." *Thou sendest thy ghost.* And still we say to give up the ghost, as the Latins said *emittere spiritum*. The word *aand*, or *aande*, or *ande*, which in Islandic signifies *breath*, in Swedish signifies *spirit* in its most exalted meaning ; as "God aer an ande : " *God is a spirit.* And in Danish the same word has all the three meanings, *wind, breath, spirit.*

† Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus have more properly *σπικεφομενον*.

‡ Our common version hath *fluttereth* ; and, at this moment, I doubt whether it be not a more proper term than the one I have substituted.

|| So also the older Saxon *Geveortbe lecht.*

phrase is just as bad, or rather more improper than the vulgarism *That there man*. It seems to have crept into our dialect from the Dutch: *Daer was een man*, &c. How much more simple and elegant our Wicliffe: "A man, Joob by name, was in the land of Hus." So the Italian of Malermi: "Nella terra de Hus era un' huomo"—and Bruccioli: "Nel paese de Us fu un huomo."—So also the Spanish of Ferrara: "Varon fue in tierra de Hus."—The French phrase indeed "Il y avoit un homme" is more ridiculous than ours: yet still it equally keeps its hold: so difficult is it to purify a language from inveterate and authorised errors!

There, as an expletive, is bad enough alone; but when the word *let* precedes it, a double pleonasm arises; and the phrase is not only more clumsy and improper; but, when put in the mouth of God, impertinent and degrading. *Let* is the same as *permit**: and when God is made to say "Let there be light," or even "Let light be;" he is made to say: "Permit light to be." So, "Let there be an expanse," &c. is equivalent to "Permit an expanse to be"—and "Let us make man," to "Permit us to make man!"—Will no writer of established credit be bold enough to deviate from the beaten track? or shall the panic dread of *innovation* prevent us from any attempt at meliorating either our *language* or our *government*?

God said, LET THERE BE LIGHT—and there was light. See how the prospect begins to brighten, if prospect it might be called, what was hardly visible. This was the first step to recover the earth from its desolate condition, and the commencement of the six days creation. It has been observed, in the explanatory note, that the light here mentioned, may readily be conceived to have been a partial, incipient light, which progressively † penetrating the dense atmosphere that enveloped the sea-covered earth, so rarefied and expanded it in the course of three days, as to admit the clear and uninterrupted vision of the celestial luminaries.

It is diverting to read the various opinions of commentators with regard to this incipient primeval light.—It was, says one, an *infant sun*, not yet grown to maturity—It was not an *infant sun*, says another, but the *elemental fire*—It was not the elemental fire, says a third, but *light in the abstract*—It was a *lucid cloud*, says a fourth, like that which led the Israelites through the wilderness—It could not be a lucid cloud, says a fifth; for that *pre-supposes* light. Well, what was it then? In my humble opinion, it was nothing more, nor less, than an emanation from the same SUN that still enlightens us; and which, although it had not yet appeared in its full glory, yet shed sufficient light through the dense atmosphere, to make the surface of the terraqueous globe visible ‡: such as we must often have observed in hazy weather; and of which we had a singular instance in last November §, in the neighbourhood of London: although even then the distinction between day and night was perfectly discernible.

This was evidently the idea of Origen, and I apprehend of Basil also. The former affirms that "no one of a sane mind can imagine that there was an evening and a morning, during

* The word *let* is one of the most singular in our language: It has two meanings diametrically opposite: to *permit* and to *hinder*. But this double signification arises from two different roots; the French *laisser*, and the Saxon *lettan*. In this last sense it would be better to write *lett*.

† This natural gradation is observable in every part of the *Hemalmeran*; and the author must have had it in view, when he sat down to write his cosmogony. See the remark at the close of the chapter.

‡ Bene hic Hezel. Gott removeirte nemlich dar Hindernis, welches er bisser der sonne gesetzt hatte.

§ 1797.

“the three first days, without a sun.” Peri Archon. l. 4. ch. 14.—The latter ascribes the darkness that covered the earth before the appearance of light to the interposition of a dense body. So Hexaem. homil. 2.

Vcr. 4. *And God saw, that the light was good*: that is, fit for its intended purposes. Syr. *beautiful*.—The author, throughout, makes the Creator speak after the manner of man; like a wife architect, who contrives, examines, and approves his plans and their execution.

Ib. *And God distinguished the light from the darkness*. I use the word *distinguish* in its proper and primitive signification. The meaning is, he assigned to each its proper boundary. Whether the author was acquainted with the rotatory motion of the earth round its axis, which effects the distinction between light and darkness, is a question of little moment. He spoke the language of ostensible nature, not that of philosophy or astronomy; of the laws of which he was, probably, ignorant.

Ver. 5. *And God called the light day, &c.* Dathe and Rosenmüller think that יָמָא should, on account of the prefix ל, be here rendered *destinavit, designavit*: *he assigned, the light to day; and the darkness, to night*. I think the *lamed* before יום and לילה warrants no such rendering.

Ib. *The evening same, and the morning came, one day*; וַיְהִי עֶרֶב וַיְהִי בקר יום אחד. These words are commonly rendered, “The evening and the morning were the first (or one) day.” A translation, which has always appeared to me contrary to the meaning of the original, and contrary to nature. An entire day, or ἡμεραν, consists not of evening and morning, but of day and night: and nothing, I think, is clearer, than that the Hebrew writer meant to express the *lapse*, not the *continuity* of time. To draw from the Hebrew words the meaning commonly given to them, they should be thus constructed: וַיְהִי עֶרֶב וּבקר ליום אחד, and even then they would seem awkward and inconsistent. For how can the evening and the morning be said to constitute a day? If taken in order as two terms of the same period of time, they embrace only the duration of night; and if they be considered separately, as the terminations of light and of darkness, they embrace no duration at all. “But,” say commentators, “the terms stand here, each for the preceding period: evening here denotes that night of darkness which covered the face of the deep, before the appearance of light; and morning denotes the day that followed that darkness.” Wonderful denotation this! *Evening*, which, according to the regular order of things, necessarily pre-supposes *day*, and is the conclusive term of day, is here converted into a night unpreceded by any day.—Thus are the clearest terms tortured to support insupportable, but inveterate, systems, sanctioned by the authority of great names. For why have the Hebrew Text, and all the antient versions, been made, contrary to the known rules of grammar, to say what they say not, what they cannot say; but because the Jews counted the hours of their artificial day from sun-setting? Had they happened to begin it at mid-night, or sun-rising, or mid-day, the evening and morning of Genesis might, with equal ingeniousness, have been adapted to any of these periods. But whatever ingenuity may be employed to pervert their meaning, ערב can here mean nothing else than the gradual disappearance of *light*; בקר nothing else than its gradual re-appearance.

I have said, that not only the original text has been misinterpreted, but also the antient versions. For all of them (except perhaps the Latin Vulgate), when properly pointed, express the true

true meaning of the Hebrew. For example, the Greek *Και ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα, και ἐγένετο πρωί, μία ἡμέρη* και εἶπε Θεός, &c.* So Syr. Chald. and both Arabs. Nay, the Vulgate itself admits the same meaning; only the repetition of *factum* is not made: for, if it were, and the comma thus distinguished, *Et factum est vespere, et factum est mane, dies unus; et dixit Deus, &c.* it would exactly correspond with the Greek and Hebrew: for it is well known that *feri* is in the Vulgate often equivalent to *esse*, as *Fiat lux*. Indeed, had the Latin translator meant to say that the evening and morning constituted the first day, he would have used another mode of expression, and said, "*Factum est vespere et mane in diem unum,*" as he does afterwards chap. 2. 7. "*Et factus est homo in animam viventem.*" But however this be, it is evident, I think, that the Hebrew writer meant to say, That when a whole *ἡμερονύκτιον*, or day and night, had passed; God, next morning, began to resume his operations upon the earth.

In justice to two great luminaries of the Greek Church, Basil and Chrysostom, I must remark, that they both reprobate in the strongest terms the idle notion which I have been combating. See Basil. Hexaem. hom. ii. and Chrysost. on Genesis, homil. iv. and v. The Latin Father, Austin, too, treating expressly on the text in question, has so well explained the matter, that I shall present the reader with his own words: "*Et factum est vespere*, et factum est mane, dies unus. Et hic calumniantur Manichæi, dum putant ita dictum esse, quasi a vespere dies cœperit. Non intelligunt operationem illam qua lux facta est, et divisum est inter lucem et tenebras; et vocata est lux DIES, et tenebræ NOX. Hanc ergo totam operationem non intelligunt ad diem pertinere. Post hanc autem operationem, tanquam finito die, facta est vespere. Sed, quia etiam nox ad diem suum pertinet; non dicitur transisse dies unus, nisi etiam nocte transactâ, cum factum est mane. Sic, deinceps, reliqui dies computantur, a mane usque ad mane. Nunc enim, cum factum est mane, et transactus est unus dies, incipit operatio quæ sequitur ab ipso mane, quod jam factum est: et post ipsam operationem fit vespere, deinde mane; et transit altera dies: atque ita, deinceps, cæteri dies transeunt.*" De Genesi contra Manich. lib. 1.—No commentator has better entered into the meaning of the text, or more clearly expressed that meaning, than this good African Bishop.—May we not hope never more to see the words rendered *The evening and the morning were the first day*: or, as the Doway translators mis-translate the Vulgate: *And there was evening and morning, that made one day.*"

It is here but fair to acknowledge that, of modern translations, those of Pagninus, Munster, Leo Judah, Junius, Oleaster, the last revision of the French version of Geneva, the Italian of Diodati †, and some others; although in some degree ambiguous, are all susceptible of the true meaning; and so are the versions of our Bate and Purver. How such men as Castalio, Houbigant and Dathe should translate as they have done, is rather a matter of astonishment; but they were all probably misled by the Latin Vulgate; and the Jewish mode of reckoning their days.

One complete day and night have now passed; and the dawn of a new day hath arisen;

* Some copies have *facta est vespere*. Austin quotes from the old Italic, which was a literal version of the Greek.

† For Bruccioli makes clear work of it, "*E fu fatto da la sera e della mattina il primo giorno.*" Nor less explicit is the French of Sacy and even of Le Gros: "*Du soir et du matin se fit le premier jour.*"

when our cosmologist makes God resume his operations, and begin the work of a ~~second~~ DAY.—Light, a partial light, had dispelled a part of the thick darkness that covered the face of the deep; but the waters of the deep still overspread the face of the earth. These waters were to be disposed of, and the ambient air to be further attenuated: for which purpose God said:

Ver. 6. *Let there be an expanse* מִן הַמַּיִם from מֵן הַמַּיִם ; the primary meaning of which is *expansion, out-stretching, attenuation, elasticity*; the very properties of our atmosphere. The word קִשְׁקָשָׁה used by the Greek translators, and the long prevailing idea that the heavens were a solid body, led posterior interpreters to render it by the word *firmament*: and this as well as קִשְׁקָשָׁה is admissible, if by solidity be meant no more, than that the fluid atmosphere has density or consistence sufficient to sustain the waters above it. This is indeed the sense in which St. Basil understood the Greek term; although he had not the Hebrew to direct him to it. See his third homily on the six days creation; where he calls it a childish idea to suppose any other solidity in the firmament, than that of a dense fluid; and very justly observes that, as such the scripture every where represents the lower region of the heavens. See Job 37. 18, and Jerem. 10. 12.

Ib. *And so it was.* I have transposed this from the end of the next verse, partly on the authority of the Septuagint*, and partly from the conviction that a uniform symmetrical mode of expression was used by the writer throughout the whole narrative. According to that symmetry, this is the proper place of the comma in question; and it is my firm belief that here it originally stood. Those who think otherwise may transpose it back.

The effect of this *expansion* was the separation of a part of the waters from the great mass. The lighter particles were exhaled, rarefied, and carried up into clouds, and formed the element of air, which is only attenuated water. The water contained in those clouds is called the waters above the *expanse*, in contradistinction to those which still remained upon the earth. See the explanatory note, vol. i. p. 2. The historian adds, that God called this expanse *the heavens*; which to me appears a strong corroboration of what I have already endeavoured to shew, that the first verse is to be referred to the following operations, and not to a prior epoch.

Ver. 8. *This, also, God saw to be good.* Here again, I think, the Greek version has alone preserved the integrity of the original text; for after no other operation is this formula wanting; and the want of it here destroys that harmony of composition so evidently intended by the author.

We have now a purer atmosphere and a clearer sky, but still our earth is drenched in water, and inept for production. That water must be partly removed, and confined within proper boundaries; and the THIRD DAY is assigned to that operation. "Let the waters, said God, be collected into one place, that the dry land may appear. And so it was; for the waters below the expanse were collected into their place; and the dry land appeared." Still the Septuagint supplies the deficiency of the present Hebrew text; for who can believe that the author would in this single instance deviate from his uniform plan, and neglect to tell us the consequence of God's command? There is a variety of reading in the Greek copies, but hardly

* I mean the Vatican, Aldine and Alexandrian copies: for the Complutensian edition, and two or three MSS. have it after ver. 7. But these copies, I presume, have been reformed according to the Hebrew.

worth remarking. The Roman, Aldine, and Oxford editions have *εις τας συναγωγας αυτων* : but the Complutensian has, more properly, *αυτων* : *υδαρ* being the antecedent.

The waters have now suddenly retired into their destined receptacles, and left a portion of the chaotic mass so dry as to be fit for vegetation. This, says our cosmologist, God called *earth*, as he called the collection of water *seas*. And, now, behold this earth vested in verdure, and replenished with all sorts of herbs and trees ; with inherent powers to reproduce themselves, and continue their propagation to the end of time ! How simply, but how beautifully, is all this expressed !

Ver. 11. *Grass*. *קטף*. It has been supposed by some interpreters, that this is not a distinct species of vegetable ; but means the bud or first shoot of both herb and tree, afterwards more particularly specified. But this is not at all probable. The distinction between *grass* and the larger *herbs* is natural, and common to all languages. Hence, *קטף* and *עץ* in Deut. 32. 2. are mentioned as distinct things ; and in 2 Kings 19. 26. *קטף* is distinguished from both *עץ* and *ציר*. So the Greeks had *χορτος*, *χλωρα*, *χλοη*, and the Latins *gramen*, *herba*, *olus*.

What now is wanting to make the scene complete ? A greater display of light ; by the full appearance of those glorious luminaries, which, optically speaking, had hitherto been veiled in mist ; which their rays had not yet been able to dissipate and rarefy into a pure azure sky. Three days had now elapsed, and a *fourth* began to dawn, when God said—

Ver. 14. *Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the heavens to illuminate the earth, and to distinguish the day from the night.*—The words *Let there be* are, in my conception, here equivalent to *Let there appear* * : and if I had allowed myself the freedom which some modern translators have taken, I should have thus rendered the verse ; “ Let the luminaries, which are in the “ expanse of the heavens, be for the purpose of illuminating the earth,” &c. The observation of Rosenmüller is so just, that I cannot withhold it from my readers : “ Verba *למנוח* *יד* non “ sunt a reliquis separanda, nec vertenda *Fiant luminaria*, quod plerique faciunt interpretes. “ Notandum est enim, verbum *יד*, si cum *ל* construitur, plerumque *destinationem rei aliqujus* “ ad *aliquid* designare ; non ejus productionem ; ut Num. 10. 31. Zach. 8. 19.”—I write *למנוח* with the Sam. copy and many mss ; not *למנוח* from which, since the introduction of points, two *vau*s have been shamefully ejected. Many thousands of words have been thus defalcated, which have their full complement of letters in the Sam. exemplar ; and almost all of them in a less or greater number of mss. This is one of the *blessings* we owe to that *wonderful work* the *Mafora*.—Were I to give a new edition of the Hebrew Bible, those vacancies should be all filled up, even without the aid of manuscript authority.

To the addition which I have admitted into the text, on the authority of the Samaritan copy, the Greek version and one ms. ; some Greek copies, such as Alex. and Cott. add *και αρχην της ημερας και της νυκτος*. The Glasgow Olateuch has, likewise, this addition ; but wants *και διαχωριζειν ανα μεσον*, &c. On the whole, there is a manifest redundancy in these two verses ; and I have some suspicion that ver. 15. is an interpolation. I have accordingly included it in brackets ; for my general rule is, not to reject altogether any thing that has the smallest probability of being authentic.

* So Cyril of Alexandria, *ἤλιου δε και σελήνης φαιμεν/το κυκλιναι*. Tom. i. p. 4.

Ver. 16. *Two great luminaries.* Heb. נֹרִים *defective*: but Sam. with seven mss. have נֹרִים *full*; and again נֹרִים instead of נֹר. I shall not henceforth mark this sort of varieties, which are very numerous indeed.—The sun and moon are equally called *great luminaries* from their equally apparent size, not from the degree of light which they give. Every thing is *optical* in this narrative, and adapted to the senses of the supposed spectator.—I am not sure but this verse might be more properly rendered: “God appointed the two great luminaries, the one “greater luminary to regulate (or rule) the day; and the other less luminary, with the stars, “to regulate the night.” So Dathe: “Deus igitur constituit duo magna luminaria; præfecit “autem, ex duobus illis luminaribus magnis, alterum majus regimini diei, alterum minus, “simul cum stellis, regimini noctis.”

Ver. 17. *He displayed them*, literally *he gave them*, יָתַן אֹתָם. The Latin Vulgate has a very singular reading, namely, “dedit eas,” as if it referred only to the *stars* which immediately precede. It is hardly credible that Jerom so wrote; and yet I find no variety in any copy that I have seen, whether edited or ms. The old Italic version seems to have had *illa*, although Austin sometimes quotes *illas*, if it be not a blunder of his transcribers. See Sabatier on the place.

Our earth is now become a delightful abode, but it is still without inhabitants. Two days more shall people it with animals; and the water itself, which had hitherto been an obstacle to production, shall first of all be made productive. “Let the waters” (said God, ver. 21.) “*swarm* with living reptiles.” Well might he use the word *swarm* שָׂרַץ; for the fecundity of fishes is beyond conception. I have translated *reptiles*, because I could not find a better term. The Latins might say *natatilia* or *natantia*; but neither would express the force of the original. And, in reality, fishes are not less reptiles than serpents; and Jerom made no scruple of using *reptile* here*.—Even in modern language, when zoological precision is not sought, *fishes* are called *reptiles*. Thus Volney, “Dieu, qui peuple l’air d’oiseaux, la terre d’animaux, et les ondes “de *reptiles*.” See the explanatory note.

Ib. *Flying creatures.* טָוֵף. It comprehends every winged creature, from the fowl to the insect. It is well expressed by the Latin word *volatile*; and in Wicliffe’s days the English word *volatile* seems to have been taken in that sense; although it is now only metaphorically used. Our more ancient Saxon version has *flying kind*, “fleogende cinn.” Those who have rendered “and flying creatures, that may fly,” &c. making טָוֵף the objective of יִשְׂרָצוּ, have not sufficiently attended to the idiom of the original. Hence however has been propagated the notion that the *flying creatures* were produced from the waters as well as the fishes.

Ver. 21. *Sea-monsters.* I have used a general term, as it is not clear what particular fish is meant, or whether the original word תַּנִּינִים be not itself a generic term. I have said in my explanatory note, that perhaps the *crocodile* may be here designated: and Mr. Hurdis, in a special Dissertation on the word, has made that highly probable. Yet still I think the *term* had a more extensive meaning, and included other animals beside the crocodile.

* And again, Pl. 104. al. 103. “Illic reptilia, quorum non est numerus.”—Diodati has *reptili*; and the Spanish of Ferrara *serpiente*. And what are *creeping things* in our common version, but *reptiles*?—Πάν το κνίκιον, (says Basil,) καὶ τῇ ἐπιφανεῖα ἐπιτρέχειν, καὶ διὰ βαθεύς τεμνὲν τὸ ὕδωρ, τῆς τῶν ἐκτετακμένων ἐστὶ φύσεως, ἐπισυρρομένων τῷ τοῦ ὕδατος σπῶματι. Hom. vii. in Hexæm.

The waters are peopled—the air is peopled—and terrestrial animals are now only wanting. So, soon as the SIXTH day dawneth, God resumes his work, and says,

Ver. 24. *Let the earth bring forth animals, according to their kinds: cattle, wild beasts and reptiles.* The word rendered *cattle* has a more extensive signification, and in general denotes any sort of larger beasts; but, when classed as here, it seems to be limited to domestic quadrupeds, distinguished from wild-beasts; literally *animals of the field* חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה: for so rightly reads the Samaritan copy. The present Heb. has חַיַּת מִדְּבָר, a vile barbarism, or, if its defenders choose, an Arabism; for certainly it is not an Hebraism. The blunder seems to have been committed before the change of letters; for in the Sam. alphabet the *he* and *vau* are often hardly distinguishable. I shall have more than one occasion to take notice of such changes.

Under the word *reptile* רֶמֶשׂ is comprehended not only all the serpentine class, but also the smaller sort of quadrupeds that seem to *creep* rather than to *walk*. In Arabic it is applied to long luxuriant grass that seems to creep over the ground; and in this sense it is still used in some parts of Scotland in its original form, RAMSH.

We are now drawing near to the conclusion of the great work; but one animal is yet wanting.

Sanctus his animal mentisque capacius altæ

Decrat adhuc; et quod dominari in cætera possit:

Natus homo est.

OVIN. Metam.

And now the narrative assumes a more solemn air, and a more dignified style:

Ver. 26. *Let us make man, &c.* What grand ideas are here presented to view! Omnipotent power seeming to exert itself, by a last effort, in the formation of a Being, which should in some degree bear its *own* resemblance! and that Being constituted the sovereign of the earth!—Cosmologists of Egypt, Chaldaea, Greece and Italy! hide your diminished heads! and read in a *Barbarian** writer a finer passage than any of you ever wrote.

On the text of this passage there is little room for critical remarks, except on the word נַעֲשֶׂה *faciamus*, *Let us make*: better *Make we*. It is asked if the use of a plural verb here imply a plurality of Gods, or at least a plurality of persons in the God-head? to speak the language of the schools. This is partly a grammatical question; and it has been remarked in the explanatory note, that the generality of Christian interpreters have considered the words addressed to JESUS CHRIST, the second person of the Trinity, in his pre-existing state. Why they might not make him as well address himself to the THIRD PERSON too, I cannot well conceive†: for there is nothing in the word that can restrain its meaning to one, two, or twenty. It is but just however to hear what they say; and the eloquent Chrysostom shall here speak for them all. “God” said: *Let us make man, &c.* Let us here interrogate a Jew, and see what answer he will give “to these words: for these words were written by Moses, whom they profess to believe. To

* The Greeks were wont to call all other nations *Barbarians*.

† This is indeed done by Severianus Gabalensis and some others. So Vatable: “Plurali numero utitur Moses, ut significaret plures subesse in Deo personas; et Patrem, in creatione hominis, advocasse in consilium sapientiam suam, et virtutem sive spiritum.”—And Mr. Biddle, the father of the English Unitarians, considers the words as addressed to the *Holy Spirit*, exclusively of the Son. See his *Life* by Toulmin, p. 41.

“whom

“whom then was it said: *Let us make man?* To some angel or archangel (say they).—Madness! impudence in the extreme! For how can it agree with reason, that an angel should be consulted by his Lord, a creature by his Creator? The province of an angel is to attend and minister, not to give counsel. Learn this from the sublime Isaiah: *I saw, says he, cherubim and seraphim standing at the right hand of God; and with their wings they covered their faces, &c.* plainly intimating that they could not bear the splendour of divine majesty; and therefore they stood fearful and trembling—for what *else* could creatures do?—Who then was he, to whom God said: *Let us make man?* Who else but HE, the Angel of the great council, the Wonderful counsellor, the Mighty one, the Prince of peace, the Father of the future age, the only-begotten SON of GOD, the equal to his Father in essence, by whom all things were made—To HIM it was said: *Let us make man.* Here (continues he) a mortal stab is given to Arianism. God saith not, imperatively: *Make thou*, as to a subject or inferior; but, with co-equal honour: *Let us make—Let us make after our own image*; clearly intimating a co-essentiality.” Chrysost. Hom. viii. in Genes. It would be hard, I think, for either Jew or Arian to support their respective opinions with more ingenuity or eloquence; whatever may be the solidity of the good Father’s argument.

Of the Jewish writers, some are of opinion, that God here addresses himself to his surrounding angels, as a King to his council of state; and R. Solomon Jarhi thinks this opinion supported by a passage in 1 Kings 22. 19, where Michaiah says to Ahab: “I saw the Lord sitting on his throne; and the whole heavenly host standing by him,” &c.—This, at least, is a very old opinion. It was that of Philo, who probably borrowed it from Plato. Others, with whom agree some of our best modern critical commentators, find in *Let us make* no more than an emphatical and majestic mode of expression; insinuating both the *power* of the Creator, and the *dignity* of the created. So Dathe: “Phrasis, *Faciamus hominem*, a multis interpretibus ad pluritatem personarum in Deo probandum adhibetur: sed perperam. Est anthropopathica locutio; qua indicatur *dignitas hominis* a Deo creandi; quem dominum rerum omnium sacere volebat . . . Sic enim solent homines, in rebus gravioribus gerendis et constituendis, agere.” Of the same sentiment are Zachariæ, Scheide, Schulze, Jerusalem, &c.

As a critic, I will only say: That the word נֶעֱשָׂה does not necessarily imply a plurality, any more than אֱלֹדִים, אֱלֹדִים, אֱלֹדִים; and I believe, that it is found even in the Hebrew writings applied to a single mortal: namely, Song of Sol. 1. 11. תִּרְרִי וְדָבַר נֶעֱשָׂה לְךָ “We will make for thee a collar of gold.” Where I am persuaded, that *we* means only Solomon himself; as in ver. 4. “We will run after thee, is only applicable to his beloved fair-one. So again, in the same verse: “We will be glad”—“We will remember.” So also, ch. 8. 8. “We have a little sister:” and in several other places of this admirable poem the plural is used for the singular. Nor is it peculiar to the Hebrew. It is quite familiar to the Arabs. The Mussulmans are certainly no Trinitarians: yet nothing is more common in the Koran than God’s speaking in the plural number. *We did—we gave—we commanded.* The same phraseology has prevailed in the western nations: and *nos, noi, nous* and *we*, are continually in the mouths of the great men of the earth. I am therefore strongly inclined to think with the writers above mentioned, that the נֶעֱשָׂה of Genesis implies no plurality of persons.—At any rate, I would say to those who imagine that they find here an argument in favour of the *Trinity*, what our Cartwright said

said near two hundred years ago—"Non mihi hujusmodi locis ad impugnandum adversarium inniti, sat tutum videtur."—But see the remark on ch. 3. 22.

Those who have thought that נַעֲשֶׂה is in the passive, and should be rendered: *Let man be made*, are deservedly laughed at by Aben-Ezrah.

Ib. *After our own image.* בְּצַלְמֵנוּ. The Greek translator seems to have read with a *chapb*; and so probably read S. Jerom.

Ib. *And according to our own likeness.* וּכְדִמְיוֹנוֹ. For so Sam. with the copulative; which here seems necessary. Some mss. and the antient edition of Brescia (1494) have *chapb* instead of *betb*. It is of little importance, which be read; although I am inclined to think there was originally either a ב or a כ before both the words.

Ib. *And all the wild beasts.* Lit. *animals of the earth*. I have preferred the reading of the Syriac. Houbigant saw the awkwardness of the present text; but would not attend to Le Clerc's suspicion; probably because it was Le Clerc's. "Suspiciabatur Clericus legendum וְכָל חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ. ובכל חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ, animantia quæ sunt in omni terra." But this conjectural emendation, although supported by an old edition of Venice, is surely not a happy one. It is remarkable that Canonico's ms. has τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς, but placed before καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν.

Ver. 28. *Subdue it.* Read כְּבִשְׁתָּהּ with Sam. and 16 mss.

Ver. 30. *All sorts of vegetables.* אֶת כָּל יֵרֶק. This, I think, is evidently a resumption; very common in every language; and here peculiarly emphatical. The copulative before אֶת is therefore to be rejected; although it be in Sep. Arab. some copies of Chald. and in 15 Heb. mss. De Rossi justly remarks, that the Latin version of the Sam. text, in the Polyglott, *omne quoque*, is not agreeable to the original; in which there is nothing equivalent to *quoque*. Neither Aquila, nor Theodotion, nor Symmachus reads the copulative.

Ver. 31. The great work is done: the creation accomplished:—and the divine architect, reviewing his work, finds every thing, every part, according to his mind; every thing in that degree of excellence which he meant to give it. "Thus it was; when God, reviewing all that he had made, saw it to be excellent."

CHAP. II.

Ver. 1. HOW this and the following verses came to be disjoined from chap. 1. is not easily accounted for. It is a proof, at least, that he or they, who made the present division, either made it very carelessly, or had very little discernment.

Six days have now elapsed; and the seventh has dawned: but, there is nothing further to be done. "For the heavens and the earth, with all their hosts, were complete." The primary idea of the word עֲבָדָה, rendered *hosts*, seems to be *decor, ornamentum*; the beautiful and regular order and arrangement of things. Hence it is here well rendered by the Greek translator κοσμος, and by Jerom *ornatus*. See the explanatory note.

Ver. 2. *On the sixth day.* בַּיּוֹם הַשִּׁשִּׁי. The obstinacy with which some sticklers for the integrity of the Masoretic Hebrew Text still defend the reading בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי on "the seventh day," is to me astonishing. Certain I am, that if this last reading had been found in the Samaritan

Samaritan copy, and the other in the Jewish copy, corroborated by the two most antient versions, the Greek and Syriac; we should hear those critics triumphantly exalting the Masoretic Text, and pointing out with great ingenuity the inconsistency of the Samaritan. In fact, the inconsistency of the present reading is apparent, at the very first sight: else, why labour to reconcile it with the context? After all, it is but a poor expedient to translate, for that purpose, *he had completed*: for still the preposition α determines him to have completed *on*, or *in the seventh day*: whereas to give a congruous meaning it should be *before* the seventh day: which α , I apprehend, never signifies; especially when it relates to time. The only example, given by Noldius, is from this very contested passage; and consequently a begging of the question. The other instances are by no means apposite, as Tympius seems willing to own; although he tries to bolster up the present one thus: “*Absolverat autem Deus in die septimo: h. e. in ipsis diei septimi et sabbati auspiciis, a sole diei sexti occumbente repetendis, omne opus suum jam ad finem perduxerat.*”—*Mirum hoc, mi Tympi!* Even Dathe, which I more wonder at, thinks the present reading defensible.—A contrast of the two days is here naturally expected; and the context seems so absolutely to require it, that I have known several persons, who knew nothing of the originals, ask with anxiety, if the word *seventh* were not an error of the press?—The same contrast is observable Exod. 20. 11. “*For in six days God made, &c. but on the seventh day,*” &c.—In short, every good argument is in favour of the Samaritan; not even a plausible one in favour of the Masoretic lection.—The Masoretic lection, however, is an ancient error; as it is followed by Onkelos, the Thargums, Jerom and both Arabs. But it is not so old as Josephus; who says expressly, that God made every thing in the space of *six days*, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \epsilon\breve{\xi}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \mu\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$; $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\alpha\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \phi\eta\sigma\iota\ \gamma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. It will be said, perhaps, that he copied from the Septuagint; but this is not probable: and at any rate the reading of the Septuagint must have been deemed the right one by the Jews of his time.

A question here occurs, whether by each of the six days, above mentioned, is meant a natural day of twenty-four hours; or some other longer period, called, accommodatively, a *day*? Some modern world-makers, to give themselves room for a slow, progressive creation, make *one day* a period of 1000 years. Why not as well ten thousand, or a million?

More ingenious is the idea of Philo, who thought that the whole history of the creation was to be understood allegorically; and calls it a vulgar simplicity to imagine, that the world was really made in the space of six days: $\epsilon\upsilon\eta\delta\epsilon\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\breve{\xi}\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\lambda\alpha\nu\ \chi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon$, $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\nu\ \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon\alpha\iota$. Cosmog. l. 1. tom. 1. p. 123. This agrees with what seems to have been a common opinion in the days of Origen: and might be plausibly defended, from the genius of the oriental style.—However this be, plain it is that the Hebrew writer, whether he divided his creation into days for the sake of a certain order, as I really think he did; or believed that things happened literally as he relates them; his *day* and *night* cannot be any other than a common day, or $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\kappa\tau\eta\ \iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ of twenty-four hours. At every other acceptation grammar and sense revolt.

Ver. 3. *God therefore blessed the seventh day, &c.*—I had at first rendered בָּרַךְ *batb blessed*, referring it to the institution of the Sabbath, which I am persuaded the cosmologist had in view: but as the word not only admits the direct and definite præterite, but to some has seemed to require it; I have altered my version, without altering my opinion. For I still think, that the *vau* here is equivalent to עָלֶיךָ; and is rather an inference drawn by the narrator, than

we find them, ver. 22, coming in seeming surprise to tell Moses what the people had done. The answer of Moses is, I think, decisive for the novelty of the institution : " This," says he, " is " what the Lord hath ordered : To-morrow is a sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord." Exod. 16. 23. Again, ver. 25, 26. " Eat it to-day : for, this day being a sabbath to the Lord, ye shall " not find it in the fields. Six days shall ye gather it : for, on the seventh day (it being the " Sabbath) there shall none be found."—Notwithstanding these repeated injunctions, some of the people, ver. 27, went out to seek manna on the seventh day : upon which the Lord expostulates thus with Moses : " How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws ? " See now, because the Lord hath appointed to you a sabbath, he therefore giveth you, on the " sixth day, the bread of two days. Abide ye, every one in his own place ; let no one go out " of his own place, the seventh day." So on the seventh *day*, subjoins the historian, the *people rested*, or kept the sabbath.

Let the unbiassed reader now say, if it be not clear from this very text, which is brought to support the contrary, that the Israelites had no conception of a sabbatical precept before this period. Indeed, it is incredible, that, if such a precept had before existed, there should be no mention of its observance in the lives of the Patriarchs, either before or after the deluge. We often read of their sacrifices, never of their sabbaths.

The only rational argument that can be urged against this hypothesis is a grammatical one; which I shall give in the words of Dathe: "Equidem non dubito assentiri eis, qui posteriorem sententiam (Deum statim in principio rerum humanarum legem de Sabbato sanxisse) defendunt. Nam si prior locum haberet; si Moses legem suam commendare Israelitis voluisset; profecto sua verba non conjunxisset per copulam *van*; ut reliqua totius narrationis connec-
tuntur; sed distinxisset ea per particulam כן על *propterea*; uti cap. ii. 24, et Exod. xx. 3, hac ipsa de re egens."

Here is a real argument, expressed with elegance and precision : and I confess that I once thought it nearly conclusive. But on a more close investigation, and consequently a more comprehensive view of the matter, I have been led to change my opinion, for the following reasons :

It seems to be granted, that if instead of *vau* there were an על כן before בריך, as there is in Exod. 20. 11, there would be no force in the objection. If then it can be shewn that *vau* has in circumstances exactly or nearly similar a meaning equipollent to that of על-כן, the balance of probability will be at least equally poised : and there are other considerations, I ween, that will make my scale preponderate.

That ו hath often the same meaning with עלֹכּוֹן, therefore, cannot be questioned : for, although a great many of Noldius's instances ought to be retrenched, as otherwise resolvable, there are evidently some in which the ו can hardly have any other meaning ; and where the mode of phrasing is almost the same as here. Thus Isaiah 44. 4. "Because thou art precious in mine eyes, &c. therefore will I give אֶחָדְךָ."—Ps. 81. 12, 13. "My people would not hear my voice, therefore I abandoned them, וַאֲשַׁלְּחֵם." See also Gen. 29. 33.—30. 13. Exod. 3. 8. Levit. 19. 27.—20. 23. Numb. 31. 50. Deut. 4. 37.—7. 11.—18. 48. In general, wherever the *vau* has a manifest reference to any of the following particles' כִּי. כֵּן. עַלֹכּוֹן. מֵאַחֵר. מֵאַחֵר. תַּת־מֵאַחֵר. יֵץ. וְיֵץ-מֵאַחֵר' and the like, it is always to be considered as an *illative*, rather than a

mere *copulative* conjunction. There is but one thing, I presume, that can be objected to the above examples; namely, that, in them, the corresponding *causative* particle precedes *vau* in the text: whereas, in the passage before us, it follows. But I can produce examples that obviate even this objection. Levit. 11. 45. "I, the Lord, am your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be a God to you: Ye shall *therefore* be holy, *because* I am holy." וְהָיִיתֶם קְדוֹשִׁים כִּי קִדְשָׁאֲנִי. Again, chap. 20. 7. "Wherefore be ye holy, *because* I, the Lord, am your God." See also ver. 26. and Numb. 19. 13.

Let me add, that the על-כן of Exodus 20. 11, instead of militating against this explication, appears greatly to corroborate it. For, there, an evident allusion is made to the sabbath so recently instituted, and the reason of the institution assigned. The third verse of the second chapter of Genesis, then, most probably alludes to the same institution, because the same reason is assigned.—So that, on the whole, I cannot but think with Jarhi, Selden, Le Clerc, &c. that the Jewish historian here, as often elsewhere, makes use of a *prolepsis*; and alludes to the Mosaic institution of the sabbath.

But whether the words be accounted a part of the narrative, or the inference of the writer, it is clear to me, that they were purposely inserted as a powerful motive to observe the sabbath day: one of the great points which the author had in view, when he composed his cosmogony.

For, now, to retrace our steps, and take a retrospective view of this whole scheme of creation, as related in the first chapter of Genesis, we can hardly avoid seeing, that *design*, premeditated *design*, characterises every part of it: and that of all the cosmogonies that could be devised, it is the best calculated to impress on the minds of a gross, carnal people, the great truths which its composer meant to inculcate; and to enforce obedience to laws and rites, principally founded on those truths.

Do I believe, then, that the narrative of Genesis is not a literally true narration? or that it is in all, or many of its parts, a pure allegory? I believe, neither the one nor the other: I believe it to be a most beautiful *mythos*, or philosophical fiction, contrived with great wisdom, dressed up in the garb of real history, adapted, as I have said, to the shallow intellects of a rude barbarous nation; and perfectly well calculated for the great and good purposes for which it was contrived; namely, to establish the belief of one supreme God and Creator, in opposition to the various and wild systems of idolatry which then prevailed; and to enforce the observance of a periodical day, to be chiefly devoted to the service of that Creator, and the solacing repose of his creatures.

In fact, what stronger motive could be urged to preserve a people from idolatry, than by shewing, in so minute a detail, that all the worship-objects of the surrounding nations were themselves but mere creatures, the great celestial luminaries (most probably the first objects of adoration) not excepted?

He had, no doubt, particularly in view the idolatry of Egypt; where, as Bossuet elegantly says, "Tout étoit Dieu, excepté Dieu même: et cette TERRE, qu'il avoit fait, pour y manifester sa gloire, sembloit être devenue un TEMPLE d'Idoles*." Beside the sun, moon and

* Dr. Blair has, in one of his sermons, literally translated this fine passage from Bossuet's *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*; with the addition, I think, of a single word; which adds nothing to the beauty of the original.

stars, they adored the fishes of the sea, the birds of the air, the animals of the earth, and even the herbs of the field, radishes, leeks and onions.

O sanctas gentes ! quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis
Numina !

It was then of the utmost importance to persuade the Israelites, who had, during their stay in Egypt, been more or less contaminated by those idolatrous rites, that every plant of the field, fish of the sea, bird of the air, and beast of the earth ; the whole visible world, in short, was the production of a superior BEING, to whom alone divine worship could be due. In particularising the greater quadrupeds *וְכִרְמֵהוּ*, and the great sea-monsters *וְדַרְיוֹנִים*, I have no doubt that he alluded, in the former, to the worship of *Apis* in the form of a bull * ; and in the latter to the *crocodile* ; which in some parts of Egypt was held in the greatest veneration.

Had our cosmologist spoken the language of metaphysical divinity, or held forth the allegorical reveries of Philo—if he had represented the Creator of the world as a pure intellectual MIND, a spirit eternal, infinite, incomprehensible, who by a single *fiat*, or rather a single *voloit*, instantaneously, and out of nothing, produced this whole visible creation ; his people would not have understood him ; they would not have listened to him. There was nothing here to arrest their attention, nothing to lay hold on their senses, nothing suited to their shallow intellects. But, by describing the CREATOR of the world, as a BEING of greater power indeed, but still a CREATOR resembling other artists ; a CREATOR according to the image and likeness of man †, by giving him rude materials to work upon, and a series of time in which to work—by making him work only by day, and repose by night ; just as, when “ the sun ariseth, man goeth forth to his work, and to his labour, until the evening :” Ps. 104. al. 103.—by making him, at every pause, review his work, and pronounce it to be good—by presenting a continued, progressive scene of darkness gradually dispelled by increasing *light*, waters evaporated or dispersed into lakes and seas, these swarming with fishes and other reptiles, a rapid vegetation taking place on the new-dried earth, the luminaries of the heavens displayed in all their splendour, the fertile soil animated into living creatures of every kind ; and man, imperial man, formed by the hands of God himself—he offered nothing to their belief, at which the senses could recoil, nothing which their comprehension could not grasp. They must, themselves, have often seen, on a small scale, a part of the great scene laid here before them. They must have seen tracts of land, completely covered with water, and unfit for vegetation, become by evaporation, or draining, the most fertile spots—they must have seen whole days of misty darkness gradually dispelled, and succeeded by glorious sun-shine ‡—they must have seen the wonderful rapidity of vegetation in many instances ; even in less time than is allowed to it by the Hebrew cosmologist—they must have seen, particularly in Egypt, the

* From which the Israelites, in the wilderness, took the idea of their *golden calf*.

† For, if man be made after the image and likeness of God, the latter must necessarily have some semblance of man.

‡ It is remarkable that the great darkness, which prevailed in Egypt, is said to have lasted just three days, the same period of time that was required to dispel entirely that primeval darkness which covered the face of the deep : and, perhaps, we shall not find in History a darkness mentioned, that lasted more than that time.

waters swarming with fish, and the soil swarming with animals, or animalcules, which seemed to rise out of the fertilised clods; and although they had never seen the largest animals generated in that manner, they might have naturally enough supposed them to have had a similar origin. Spontaneous generation was, most probably, believed by them, as well as by most other nations: and the banks of the Nile were celebrated for that species of fecundity. See Ovid's beautiful description of reanimated nature after the deluge. *Metam.* l. i. v. 416. Even in the narration of the Hebrew writer, it is the water and the earth that are said to be the immediate producers of fish and animals, although that productive power is communicated to them by the Deity.

As to man, he is not produced in that manner, for a very apparent reason: namely, to give him a greater degree of dignity, as being formed, indeed, out of the same earth with the other animals, but formed directly and immediately by the hand of God, and animated by the *breath* of his mouth: hence, and from the dominion imparted to him over the earth and its contents, he is said to be made according to the image and likeness of God himself.—A wiser system of cosmogony could not, certainly, be imagined: and I doubt much if Alphonsus*, with all his mathematical and astronomical skill, could have framed so good a one; or, at least, one that would have been so much relished by the people to whom it was addressed. Every thing in it bears testimony to the great sagacity, and deep knowledge of mankind, of the sapient inventor. The very circumstance of making God speak, as well as act, in a manner suited to the conceptions of the Hebrew nation; and speaking in their own rude uncultivated dialect, was an admirable device to gain attention to his narrative, and respect to his theory. God speaking pure Hebrew, in the very creation of the world, and ever after communicating his will in that tongue, could not fail of inspiring them with high ideas of their language as well as of their laws; and of making them consider both as peculiarly sacred.

Another end which the cosmologist had in view, when he distributed the work of creation into six days, followed by a day of repose, was evidently to enforce the observance of a weekly Sabbath; a most excellent and humane institution; on two accounts: first, as a day of religious worship "holy to the Lord;" and secondly, as a day of solacing repose to the human, and even to the brute creation. On that blessed day, the neck of the noble steer bended not under the galling yoke; the patient camel carried not, through the sandy scorching desert, its grievous load; the mule felt neither the weight nor goad of its rider; and the ill-treated, useful, ass was, for a day, delivered of its unequal burthen. The man-slave and the maid-slave were, with respect to labour, during that day, on the same footing with the children of the family, with the master himself; distinction of rank seemed for a while suspended, and equal rest and festal joy were common to all.

But could any motive be more powerful to recommend and enforce this wise benevolent institution, than to make the Divinity himself observe it after the creation of his work?—Indeed it required a not less powerful motive. The sordid interests of man, his greediness of

* Alphonsus X. king of Castile, the greatest astronomer of his day, was wont to say, that if God had consulted him in the formation of the world (alluding no doubt to the Hebrew cosmogony), he could have given him some good advice.

gain, and insatiable avarice, are not easily restrained by ordinary inducements: and we find that, in spite of God's *example*, and *command*, sabbath-breaking was no uncommon transgression among the Hebrew people.

I have now fairly and candidly delivered my opinion of the nature and purport of the Hebrew cosmogony, comprehended in the first chapter of the book of Genesis and a few verses of the second. But I set not up for a dogmatist. I have read much on the subject. I have long revolved it in my mind, and placed it in every possible point of view. I have not drawn my conclusions with precipitation; nor till after a very serious and minute investigation: and the result is what you have been just now reading.

———Si quid novisti rectius istis,

Candidus imperti; si non, his utere mecum.

From what I have said, the reader must not imagine that my opinion is peculiar to myself. Some of the first scholars and critics of the age think very little differently. I shall name only the celebrated Eichhorn, who has in the ivth vol. of his Biblical Repertory expressly and learnedly treated on the subject; and to whose sentiments, in general, I willingly subscribe; although from him I did not borrow mine. But that the curious reader may know where he can find what has been written on the other side, I will point out to him the following works: Rau's *Programma 'De fitione Mosaica falso adserta'*; the elder Rosenmüller's '*Antiquissima telluris historia a Mose descripta.*' And Doederleén's '*Institutes of Christian divinity*':—or, if these volumes be not at hand, he may read what Dathe and Rosenmüller the son have said; the former in his translation of the Pentateuch; the latter in his first vol. of '*Scholia.*'

I hasten to the second chapter; which is, at present, pretty generally supposed to be another cosmogonical fragment, written by a different person, and inserted by Moses in his commentaries as a curious piece of antiquity. I confess I have never been able to view it in that light: after all the pains that Astruc, Eichhorn and others have taken to prove the diversity, I can find nothing in it but a natural resumption of the subject, by the same pen which wrote the first chapter; and with the same wise, political and religious views. As I have given in my preface to the Pentateuch a table of all the passages which, according to Eichhorn, belong to the writer of this supposed second fragment; and as I have there declared my intention of discussing the subject at large in my general Preface; I shall here say no more of the matter; but endeavour to explain my text, as a critical commentator.

I have already observed, that the first six verses of ch. 2. belong to the first, and are a comprehensive summary of the foregoing narrative.—*Such*, says the author, (ver. 4.) *was the origin of those heavens and this earth, on their being created; at what time the Lord God created the earth and the heavens.* There is, in the last member of this verse, a various reading, which was unintentionally omitted in my first vol. p. 4. namely, The Sam. Text and Version, the Greek, Syriac and Vulgate have, instead of *the earth and the heavens*, *the heavens and the earth*, in the same order as just before; and this reading is preferred by Houbigant, and followed by Michaelis and Dathe: yet I am inclined to think that the Hebrew Text, with Onkelos, the Thargums, both Arabs, and the Perfic, have the original reading; and that the
other

other was first introduced to make it tally with the foregoing member, and with ver. 1. of ch. 1. If this be allowed, I think it is another proof that the cosmologist meant to confine his narrative merely to the six days creation; and that the *heavens* of ch. 1. ver. 1. were not prior heavens, but the heavens that became visible at the time of the six days creation: namely, that wide expanse mentioned ch. 1. ver. 8. and which is expressly denominated *the heavens*.

Ver. 5. *Hiberto*, continues he, *neither plant nor herb of the field existed, nor could grow upon the earth: for the Lord God had yet caused no rain to fall upon the earth, nor were there men to till the ground: but a flood, rising out of the earth, drenched the whole face of the ground.*—The only remark which I have here to make is, that the word which I render *flood*, *טֶבַח*, has been by most modern translators rendered a *vapour* or *cloud*: most erroneously, in my opinion; and in despite of the context. For it is evidently the intention of the writer to depict the state of the earth before the six days creation; when it was incapable of producing either plant or herb, which could not grow while the earth was covered with water, when no salutary showers had yet moistened the thirsty soil; and when men existed not to till it. The word *טֶבַח* then must necessarily denote that efflux of water, which, issuing from the bosom of the then unfashioned earth, covered its whole surface; and which is justly called the *deep*. Whereas if a *vapour* or *misty cloud* had only watered the face of the ground, it would have been equally serviceable as a rain to make the earth vegetate.

The truth is, all the antient interpreters understood the word properly, although they have not all rendered it by the best terms in their respective languages. The Greek Scp. has *πηγή*, followed by the Vulgate, *fons*: and both these terms are admissible in their stronger signification; that is, in the same sense in which they are used ch. 7. ver. 11., where *the fountains of the great deep* are said to have been broken up: but still the Greek word used by Aquila *ἐπιλυγμος**, or *ἐπιλυσμος*, and the Syr. *מַבְרַח* (which ought to be rendered not *fons*, as in the Polyglott, but *scaturigo*) are far more suitable.—Onkelos, indeed, has *נֶבֶח* a *cloud*; and both Arabs, as they are now pointed, have a word that denotes *vapour*: but I suspect that the right reading is *בְּרַחַר*, not *בְּרַחַר*; and then it would coincide with Syr. and Aq.: and be consistent not only with the context, but with ch. 1. ver. 2., where a word from the same root is used, by Saadias, to denote the earth's being *immersed in water*†.—However this be, certain, to me, it is that *טֶבַח* never signifies *vapour*. It occurs but twenty-six times in the whole Hebrew Scripture; and, in twenty-four of these, it is allowed to signify some great and sudden calamity, destruction, and the like. These are, doubtless, metaphorical meanings, and are, indeed, chiefly found in poetical composition: but surely such a metaphor could never be derived from a *vapour* or *mist*. It might be drawn from the *bursting* of a watery cloud, or the *bursting forth* of water from the earth; and this, I presume, we shall find to be the literal and primitive meaning of *טֶבַח*. Let us compare it here with the only other place in which it has not a metaphorical meaning; although even there it includes a sort of metaphor, namely Job 36. 27.

* There is a typographical error in Montfaucon, *ἐπιλυγμος*. It is probable that Aquila, who was extremely terrified of the *leues*, every where translated the Hebrew word in the same manner, even when it had a metaphorical application. See Prov. 1. 16.

† The Peric translator retained the Arabic word, and must stand or fall by it.—The Thargums follow Onkelos in their wild paraphrastic manner.

The words of the original are, *יִקַּח מִנֵּר וְיִפְּרֹשׁ לְאֶמֶד*, which our translators render, “For he *maketh small* drops of water; they pour down rain, according to the vapour thereof:” giving to *נָרַע* a meaning which it never hath; and to *אֶמֶד* a meaning which it cannot have.—I say, they have given to *נָרַע* a meaning which it never has. I have carefully examined every passage in which it occurs; and can affirm, that it never means to *make small* in the sense here assigned to it. It may sometimes be translated to *diminish*, as, to *diminish* one’s wages: but it never has the same meaning with *comminuere*, or to *make small*. Its proper signification is to *restrain, keep back, withdraw*; and in this same chapter, ver. 7. it is fitly rendered in our public version by the last of those terms: “he *withdraweth* not his eyes from the righteous.” Why this should not have led them to give it the same meaning in ver. 27., is only to be ascribed to their implicitly following Montanus, who changed Pagninus’s *prohibebit* into *minuet*: for the French Geneva version, which they sometimes followed, has very properly rendered *Quand il a souffrait*. So the Chaldee paraphrase *יִנָּעַר מֵאֶמֶד*, and Jerom, but not so well, *qui aufert**. The first comma, then, of ver. 27. must necessarily be rendered “when he *restraineth*, or, *hath restrained*, the drops of water.”—Let us now see what sense can be made out of the last comma.

The sagacious reader will, perhaps, anticipate the conclusion, and say, “The drops of water, in consequence of being restrained, will accumulate into a cloud, which cloud will at length burst, and produce a copious rain.”—This is precisely the case, as is expressly marked in the next following verse. Whether, then, we read with the present text *וְיִקַּח* from *וְיִקַּח*, or with 8 mss. *וְיִקַּח* from the Chal. *וְיִקַּח* or *וְיִקַּח*; and whether we adopt Houbigant’s conjectural reading *וְיִקַּח* for *וְיִקַּח*; we must, in either case, exclude *vapour*; and, if we retain *אֶמֶד*, translate with Jerom, *gorges*; or, admitting *וְיִקַּח*, render it *bottles*; that is, swollen clouds; a metaphor elsewhere employed by the writer of the book of Job, ch. 38. 37.—In this latter supposition, *אֶמֶד* will be out of the question; in the former supposition, it will have the same meaning which it has in Genesis; an *efflux* or *gush* of water, emitted from a cloud.

Long as this remark has been, I cannot help concluding it with two quotations, the one from an antient, the other from a modern commentator. The former is Diodorus, in Theodoret; who, after citing the Septuagint version Πῆλη δὲ, &c., adds: Λέγει μὲν γὰρ, ὅτι ἐκάλυπτο πάντα [ἡ γῆ] ὑπο τῶν ὑδάτων· εἰρηκε δὲ αὐτὸ ἕως πῶς, ὡς αὖ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς γῆς ΒΑΤΖΟΝΤΑ τε καὶ ΠΗΓΑΖΟΝΤΑ τὰ ὕδατα, καὶ ἐξ ὅσας αὐτῆς φερομένα ἕως πᾶσαν αὐτὴν συνεκάλυπτον. In substance, “The meaning is, that waters *gushing* out as it were in so many *springs*, from every part of the earth, overflowed and entirely covered it.”—Nor less clear and just is the interpretation of the acute and sapient Oleaster: “Ignota est Hebræis significatio nominis *אֶמֶד*; unde Chaldæus vertit *nubem*, Sanctes *vaporem*, qui postquam in pluviam resolvebatur. Sed mirum valde est, illos ponere pluviam, antequam esset pluvia. . . . Vulgatus interpres verius *fontem* arbitratur. Qui *vaporem* aut *nubem* significare putant, ex illo Job 36. 27. occasionem sumpserunt. Sed, meo iudicio, unica est nominis significatio, scilicet *inundatio*; quæ convenit omnibus locis in quibus nomen ponitur †. Illud autem Job citatum sic reddendum est, *effundent nubes pluviam ad inundationem ejus*. Unde hic (Genes. 2. 6.) vertendum puto: *Sed inundatio ascendebat*

* The Greek and Syr. must have read a different word. See c. x. on the place.

† He means in its metaphorical meaning: for every sudden calamity may fitly be termed an inundation of evils.

"*de terra, et rigare faciebat omnem faciem terræ. Neque intelligas unicum fontem de terra ascendisse; sed, Hebraico more, inundationem pro inundationes ponit.*"

Nothing, I think, can be more accurate than this explanation. May we not hope, then, to see no more a *vapour* in this passage?

Our cosmologist having, in the first chapter, traced, with a rapid but skilful hand, the whole plan of creation, resumes a part of his subject, and gives a more particular account of the creation of man. Here we still discover the wise and artful mythologist. He had already told us that man was made after the semblance and image of God, and that he was made *male* and *female*: but he had not told us how, or of what materials. The materials, he now tells us, were the dust of the ground; and that dust, being animated by God's own breath, became a living person: first particularity in the creation of man, not mentioned in the former chapter.

We are then told, that an abode, suitable to man's dignity, had been previously prepared for him; a paradise, or garden of pleasure, in which was every plant that could please the eye, or gratify the taste; and in the midst of the garden, a tree, called the "*tree of life*;" and another called the "*tree of the knowledge of good and evil*."—The fruit of this last tree man is forbidden to taste, under pain of immediate death, or at least of immediate mortality: but he may eat with freedom of all the rest.—A convention of all the terrestrial and ærial animals is now assembled by God, and presented to Adam; to whom he sagely gives appropriate appellations: but, in his survey of their natures and qualities, he finds no animal like himself. God sees his disappointment and distress; pities his solitary condition; throws him into a deep sleep; extracts one of his ribs, and fashions it into the form of a woman. This beauteous form Adam, on awaking, views with rapture, acknowledges to be his own counterpart; and, informed (no doubt by God) whence she had been taken, he exclaims: "*This, now, is bone of my own bone, and flesh of my own flesh! WOMAN let her be called; since out of MAN she was taken.*"

Religious, but intelligent reader! wert thou to read all this in any book but the Bible, what wouldest thou think? Wouldest not thou think, and say, "*It is a pretty poetical tale*;" and rank it in thine own mind with the metamorphoses of Ovid?—Well, let me ask, What reason hast thou to believe that it may not be a poetical tale, even in the Bible? Are there no such tales there? Is every Bible-narrative literally true? He will be a hardy man, I think, who shall dare to affirm it.

We have already seen that not only the more learned of the Jews, but some of the most learned of the Christian fathers, found it necessary, in their explanations of the Hexameron, to have recourse to allegory in order to elude the strong objections of their adversaries against the Hebrew cosmogony. "*Moses, said they, speaks of a successive six days work, to suit the capacity of his people, and to give them a more distinct idea of every part of creation. It is contrary to the notions which we have of Divine omnipotence, to say, that this is a literal historical narration, and that God left off, and resumed, his labour, every evening and morning, for six consecutive days; and at length reposed entirely on the seventh day. Such passages of Scripture ought never to be taken in their literal meaning, but should be considered as tropological representations.*"—Such is the language of Origen, such the language of Austin, not to mention others of less learning and piety, who have either expressed their sentiments in similar terms, or laid down principles teeming with similar conclusions. And although the

contrary

contrary opinion, of the other fathers, has been generally followed by modern interpreters *, it is not for that the more defensible, or more favourable to religion. For, better, surely, allegorize with Austin and Origen, than admit a literal explanation, which, if what we are taught to believe concerning the nature and attributes of God be true, must necessarily be false.

Both the fathers, just now mentioned, had to deal with acute and subtle adversaries; Origen with Celsus, Austin with the Manicheans. They were unwilling to give up the inspiration of the sacred Books; but, as the objections pressed hard upon them, in the supposition that the narration was to be literally understood, they were obliged to elude their force by having recourse to allegory. "Who, says Origen, is such a simpleton, *ηλίθιος*, as to imagine that God, like a husbandman, planted a Paradise in Eden; or planted in it a tree of life, a visible and palpable tree; so that he who should, with his bodily teeth, eat of its fruit, should receive life; or that, eating of another tree, he should acquire the knowledge of good and evil?—No one, I think, will have any doubt, that these things, although apparently historical, are tropically to be understood, and indicate certain mysteries: *οὐκ οἶμαι διαστρέφειν τινὰ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τροπικῶς διὰ δοκούντων ἱστορίας; καὶ οὐ σωματικῶς γεγενημένης, μάρτυρι τινὶ μυστηρίου*. Periarch. l. iv. No. 16."—Severianus Gabalensis, who blushes for the allegorists, and bids them blush (*αἰσχυνέσθωσαν δὲ ἀλληγοροῦντες*), and explains every part of the creation literally, takes another way to refute the objections made against it.—He abuses the objectors; calls them blasphemers, infidels, and other harsh names. Yet he is often puzzled with the facts; makes queries to himself which he cannot answer; and grants principles that destroy his own assertions. And this is the general method of the other fathers who follow his mode of interpretation.

My readers must not think, that, because I admire the ingenuity of those good fathers, in getting rid of troublesome objections by taking refuge under the shield of allegory, I therefore am satisfied with their allegorical system. I am altogether dissatisfied with it; and have brought it forward only to shew the difficulties that attend the Hebrew cosmogony, considered as a real history: difficulties that appear to me unsurmountable.

But let it be once granted, that it is a mere poetical mythos, historically adapted to the senses and intellects of a rude unphilosophical people; every obstacle will be removed, every objection obviated, every sarcasm repelled; whether it come from a Celsus or a Porphyry, a Julian or a Frederic, a Boulanger or a Bolingbroke.

What then, may we suppose, had the writer in view, when he composed this part of his mythology? He had in view, I conceive, two important points: to mortify the *pride* without depressing the *dignity* of man; and to inculcate the strict and indissoluble union of man and woman in the matrimonial state. "Man! (seems he to say) remember thine origin; thou wast formed of the dust of the ground; be therefore humble: but, Man! remember also that that dust was animated by the *breath of God*, and after God's own likeness; debase not the divine image by brutal actions."—Both these inferences are so well drawn by the eloquent Chrysostom, that I cannot refrain from abridging what he says, commenting on the passage, in his 12th homily on Genesis. "What sayest thou, Moses! God, taking *dust of the earth*, formed man? Truly; not simply *earth*, (says he) but *dust*, the most vile and lightest part of the

* Cajetan, Melchior Canus, and some others perhaps, are exceptions.

"earth!—If to this circumstance we attend, a great lesson of humility is presented to us. For, when we consider whence our nature drew the first principle of its constitution, we check every motion of pride, every haughty supercilious idea, were they to arise in thousands! We become humble, and learn modestly, by reflecting on our original substance:" *ὅταν γὰρ ἐννοήσωμεν, πόθεν εἶχε τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς συστάσεως ἡ φύσις ἡ ἡμετέρα, καὶ μυιακῆς τὰς σφύρας ἀνοσπασσώμεθα, συστειλλομένθα, ταπεινωμένθα, τὴν οὐσίαν ἑαυτῶν ἀναλογιζόμεθα, μετρίαζέιν παιδευόμεθα.*—On the other hand, learning "that man thus formed of dust became a living person, by being inspired with the breath of life, by the mouth of God! we ought ever to bear in mind this noble privilege of soul; and never do any thing unworthy of it." *Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἐννοοῦντες, καὶ λογιζόμενοι τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς, μὴδὲν ἀνάξιον αὐτῆς διαπραΐτωμεθα.* With respect to the other point, it is clear that no argument could be more cogent, or conducive, to rivet the chains of marriage, and enforce the intimate union that ought to subsist between husband and wife, than by making the first wife a part of her husband's own body, and extracting her from his own side. Just, then, is the writer's conclusion: "Hence, a man should leave even his father and his mother, and cleave to his wife: for these two are but one flesh."

There might be another subordinate view in the account of the formation of woman; and in making that operation take place after Adam's review of the other animals; namely, the very great boon bestowed, in purposely framing for his aid and solace so suitable and lovely a companion as woman. This is, precisely, the language of the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 8. 9. "For man came not from woman, but woman from man: nor was man created for the woman, but woman for the man."—It may be worth remarking, that the Hebrew word which I render *fashioned*, and our vulgar version *made*, is neither *בָּרָא creavit*, nor *עָשָׂה finxit*, but *בָּנָה edificavit*. This difference makes Chrysostom exclaim, "How great the power of the divine ARCHITECT! which of such an insignificant particle of matter (as a rib) constructed such elegantly proportioned limbs, such fine sensations; so perfect, so accomplished, so complete an animal." *Ποσὴ τῆ ἀριστοτεχνίας Θεοῦ ἡ δύναμις, ἀπὸ τοῦ βραχυτάτου μέρους ἐκείνου τοσούτων μελῶν ἀναλογίαν ἐργασασθαι, καὶ τὰς αὐτῆς αἰσθητικὰς δημιουργήσαι, καὶ τέλειαν καὶ ὁλοκληρὴν καὶ ἀπληρυσμένον ζῶον κατασκευασθαι.* "And all this, says he, for the comfort and solace of man." *Διὰ γὰρ τὴν τοῦτ᾽ παρακλήσιν τοῦτο ζῶον ἐδημοουργήθη.* Chrys. Hom. xv.

Although the story of Paradise, in the second chapter of Genesis, comes in between the formation of man and the construction of woman, I have joined the two last in my Remarks, as being more intimately connected; and have reserved for the first a separate concluding article.

But before we proceed, we must again recur to the first chapter, in which it is repeatedly said; that every thing which God created was *good*, was *very good*. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? Evil of any sort proceeding, immediately, from an all-wise, all-powerful, all-just, all-beneficent Being, would be altogether unaccountable. All God's creatures, then, were made to be happy; each class in its own sphere, and according to its proper capacity. Even the reptiles of the waters God *blessed*: that is, he bade them be happy. But if the reptiles, birds and beasts were made for bliss and happiness, in their respective conditions, how much more so that creature which was formed after God's own image and likeness, and doomed to have dominion over all the rest!

All this, I presume, will be readily granted me: and I demand no more for the propriety of placing man in a terrestrial paradise, by the Hebrew cosmologist. Where else, indeed, could be have placed him? Not surely in some dreary and unproductive desert; nor even in a better unbroken soil, where it should be necessary for the sovereign of the earth to toil like a slave for subsistence, and *eat his bread in the sweat of his face!* No; he was to be placed in a spot, which without any other cultivation or keeping, than arises from pleasure, should afford him every necessary sensual gratification. Such a place was the garden of Eden, prepared and planted by the hand of God as a proper receptacle for his favourite Man.—Whether such a garden ever really existed, is a question of little moment: an ideal paradise equally answered the writer's purpose; which is evidently to inculcate on the minds of his readers the original happiness of man. The mythologists of all nations have acknowledged a *golden age*: and this was the golden, but short-lasting, age of Hebrew mythology.

Much learning has been employed to ascertain the situation of this *real*, or *ideal* garden: and the most fanciful topographic systems have been hazarded. Yet the Hebrew writer has given us such water-marks and land-marks, as might seem to settle the controversy, if, indeed, it be worth the pains of settling. The names of the four capital streams, which are said to have issued out of Eden, and of the countries which two of them bounded, are expressly mentioned. The course of the third is described; and the fourth was too well known to need be more than named; the *Phrath*, or *Euphrates*.—It is little less certain that the *Hiddekel*, or rather *Dekel* (for I am persuaded that the Sam. reading דקל is the true one), is the *Tigris*: as indeed almost all the antient translators render it; Sep. *Tyrys*, Syr. דקלת, Chal. דגלה, Arab. دجلة, Vulg. *Tigris*.—But what rivers are the *Phison* and the *Gibon*? Josephus makes the former the *Ganges*, the latter the *Nile*; and in this he has unaccountably been followed by some more recent interpreters.—Others make them change sides, and call *Phison* the Nile, and *Gibon* the Ganges; alike absurdly: for the sources of the Nile and Ganges have no connection nor communication with the Tigris and Euphrates*.

The very learned Bochart, who has sometimes, not ineptly, been called the *Father of conjectures*, and his countryman Huet, whom we commonly call Huetius, out of the *two* last-mentioned rivers contrive to make the *four*. They place their Paradise on a bend of that great stream which is formed by the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, about Bassora: and of the two channels, into which that stream is again divided before it enter the Persian gulf, they will have the eastern one to be the *Gibon*, and the western the *Phison*. But how, in the name of sense, can that stream be called a source, whence four different *capital streams* flow?—Yet the system has been adopted by several latter commentators; and defended and illustrated by our Wells in his *Historical Geography of the Old Testament*. It is now, I believe, entirely given up; at least on the Continent.

Michaelis, indeed, has risked an opinion somewhat similar. He supposes that the word נהר here signifies not one *stream*, but the four rivers after mentioned; at, or a little above, the confluence of which he would place the garden of Eden. Hence thus he renders verse 10.

* Severianus Gabalenus makes *Phison* the *Danube*.

“ Rivers went out of Eden, to water the garden ; and these ever diverging, one from another, “ had four springs, or sources, מַעְיָן *.”

The stress of Michaelis's argument, in favour of this interpretation, lies chiefly on the words נָדָר and מַעְיָן ; the former signifying not a *spring*, but a *river* ; the latter not a *river*, but a *spring* or *head*. It is true that נָדָר signifies a *river* ; but it is also true that this appears not to be its radical meaning ; which I take to be a *copious efflux* of water, light or any other liquid. A copious spring of water, gushing from a rock, and immediately forming a sufficient stream to water the garden of Eden, might then aptly be called נָדָר ; and that נָדָר might afterwards be parted into four *heads*, or *capital streams* ; such as the Euphrates, Tigris, Phasis and Araxes certainly are. Ay, but מַעְיָן signifies a *source* ; and not a *capital stream*, running from that source. This, indeed, is the question : but this question must not be solved by doing violence to the Text, but by extending the meaning of מַעְיָן. Now it is not more abusive to say that a source or stream is divided into four *heads*, than to say that we divide a subject, or discourse, into four *heads*. The place, where each of these rivers parted from its parent stream, was as much *it's* head, as if it had arisen from a different source.—Besides, as Dathe has well observed, if the author had meant to say that the *river* which went out of Eden ramified backwards to four different springs, he would have written, not וַיֵּצֵא לְאַרְבַּעָה מַעְיָן, but וַיֵּצֵא לְאַרְבַּעָה נָדָר. “ It had four heads.” *Fuerunt illi quatuor capita.*—Finally, how frigid is it to say, that four rivers have four springs ! *Deinde, frigidus esse sensus videtur, si de fluvii narratur, eos habere fontes, ex quibus oriantur.*

Le Clerc places the terrestrial Paradise in Syria, and in the neighbourhood of Damascus ; chiefly, because in that district he finds an Eden. But *Eden* is a common name, that denotes any *delightful situation* ; and is the name of several places at this day. However, Le Clerc places his Paradise in Syria ; and his Phison is the *Chrysorroas* ; his Gihon, the *Orontes*.—But this system has likewise been generally exploded †.

Some, with Carverus, will have *Phison* to be the *Pasitigris* of Pliny ; and *Gihon* the *Cydnus* of Justin.—But the most singular of all systems is that of T. W. Wrighte, A.M. in his *Explanation of the first two chapters of Genesis*, printed in 1788. According to him, Phison is the brook *Arnon* ; Gihon the *Jabbok*, Hiddekel the *Jarmock*—and what, think ye, is Euphrates ?—The upper *Jordan* ! “ This (says he) was the river which went out of Eden, to water the “ garden ; the main channel of which was formed by the conflux of four streams (and is there- “ fore not unfrequently called in Scripture, נָדָר עֶזְרָא, ὁ ποταμός, or ὁ ποταμός ὁ μέγας.) The “ name of the first, *Arnon* ; the name of the second, *Jabbok* ; the third *Jarmock* ; and the fourth, “ the stream of the lesser *Jordan* itself ; *ipse Perath*, or the river Euphrates.” This is commenting with freedom. But to proceed—

Reland and Calmet will have the Phison to be the *Phasis*, and the Gihon the *Araxes* : and this opinion, which they have both defended with much ingenuity, is at present the prevailing

* Es quollen auch flüsse aus Eden hervor, den garten zu wässern ; und sie gingen immer weiter von einander, und hatten vier uhrsprünge oder quellen.—The Greek Version of Venice seems to lean the same way. καὶ οὕτως διαίρουτο, ἔλθουσι τ' εἰς τέσσαρας ἀρχάς.

† The word *caput* has the same latitude, and is used by Cæsar in the same sense, De Bell. Gall. 4. 10. where, speaking of the Rhine, he says, “ multis *capitibus* in oceanum influit.” I owe this remark to Archbishop Secker.

one. I must say, however, that it is attended with many difficulties, which, perhaps, will never be entirely removed. The truth is, that, with all our improvements in geography, we know very little about the real springs and courses of any one of those rivers : and nothing less than an actual survey, and tracing them, through all their meanders and ramifications, can lead us to any certain conclusion on the subject*.

It is, indeed, a question of no importance; and I almost regret to have bestowed on it so much time and ink. Yet, since my hand is in, I must, as a Philologist, say something about the etymon of the rivers and other proper names here mentioned.

Phison פִּיֶּסֶן, if it be not a foreign word, may be derived from פִּסַּח, which denotes *exuberation*; a term perfectly suitable to a large, deep, expatiating river; such as the Phasis certainly is : which rolls along its waters with great majesty, and is continually increasing by influent streams.

Gibon, גִּבּוֹן from גָּבַח, גָּבַח or גָּבַח; which denotes *impetuosity, eruption, bursting forth*; signifies the *impetuous, eruptive* river : an epithet peculiarly adapted to the *Araxes*, which breaks down every bridge † and barrier in its rapid course.

It is not, indeed, the *Araxes*, but the *Oxus*, which now bears the Arabic name *Gibon* : but this is no formidable objection; as *Gibon* seems to have been a common appellation for any exuberating rapid stream. The Nile and the Ganges are sometimes so called.—The great difficulty in the hypothesis of Reland lies in this : that the sources of his four rivers are at too great a distance, one from another, to be said to issue from the same spot. It has been answered; that the universal deluge may have changed their sources and channels. Granted; but the author of *Genesis* wrote long after the universal deluge, and must have had in view the situation and springs of rivers then existing.—If the real sources of the Tigris and Euphrates could be fully ascertained; and if these two were found nearly to meet; the sources of the two other rivers might possibly be detected, nigh to that place : but these, I think, cannot be the Phasis and Araxes; unless their courses were very different in the time of our Hebrew writer, from what they now are.

After all, it may well be, that we are labouring to find out a spot that never existed but in the creative imagination of the mythologist. It was necessary for him to place his Paradise somewhere : and the fertility and richness of those countries through which ran the Tigris and Euphrates, would naturally lead him to place it about their sources : which, with two other capital rivers, he makes to flow from one common spring, which watered his garden of Eden. In this imaginary hypothesis, I see no difficulty in admitting the Phasis and Araxes to be the *Phison* and the *Gibon* of *Genesis*.—If the learned Josephus, and the Jews of his day, were so ignorant of geography, as to make the Nile and the Ganges two of the rivers that flowed from Eden; how easy was it for the Hebrew mythologist to bring rivers together, that never met, to embellish his story : rivers celebrated over all the East for the fertility of soil, and the rich productions, of their coasts!

This naturally brings us to the countries which the Phison and Gibon are said to have bounded; and which, in some respect, should guide us to the course of the rivers themselves.

The Phison, says the Hebrew writer, “ boundeth the whole land of Havila, where gold is

* See *Michaëlis's* Supplementa ad Lex. Hebr.

† Pontem indignatus Araxes. VIRGIL.

“ found;

“found; and excellent is the gold of that land.”—The word *Havila*, חַוִּילָה with the article, comes from חָוַל *sand, dust, any small particle* of matter; which signification it retains in Chald. Syr. Sam. חוּלָה, חוּלָה, חוּלָה. The appellative-proper חַוִּילָה, then, denotes the *land of dust*; i. e. *dust by excellence, or gold-dust*; as we call a part of Africa the *Gold-dust coast*; and sometimes simply the *Dust-coast*.—The name is perfectly applicable to the country bounded by the Phasis: every school-boy has heard and read of *Calchis* and the *Golden-fleece*: and it is well known that gold-dust, or that which is found in small unmixt particles in the beds of rivers, is the purest and best gold. *Nec absolutius aurum est* (says Pliny) *cursu ipso trituque perpolitum*.—Indeed I think it highly probable, that all the rivers and rivulets which run into the Euxine, are, or were formerly, productive of gold, from the Phasis to the Halys. It was, probably, from those rivers, that Cræsus, king of Lydia, drew his immense riches.

Not only *gold* was found in the land of Havila, but also “*pearls and onyxes*,” for so I have rendered the words חֶסֶדֶם וְחִלְמָן.—But, although I have so rendered, I am not sure that such is precisely the meaning; and therefore it is but fair to state the case as it is.—The word חֶסֶדֶם, or, as 5 mss. have it, חֶסֶדֶם, occurs but twice in the Hebrew Scriptures: here, and in Numb. 11. 7. We there learn that, in colour, it resembled the *manna*: whence, and from a similarity of sounds, it has generally been thought to be the Greek βδέλλιον and the Latin *bdellium*; a resinous gum, which we have from Arabia and the Indies; and which, in colour, has certainly some resemblance to the manna of our shops. But whether the manna of our shops and the manna of the Israelites be the same, is yet an undecided question: nor is the mere similarity of sound a sure etymological criterion; unless strengthened by other circumstantial evidence.

The ancient interpreters render the word variously. Scp. αἰσθαῖ here, but in Num. αἰσθαῖον. The other Greek translators have in both places βδέλλιον.—Onkelos and the Targums retain the Hebrew word חֶסֶדֶם or חֶסֶדֶם. Syr. in the printed text has, in both places, חֶסֶדֶם with a *resb* instead of *daleth*: but Michaëlis deems this a typographical error: and such it may be; for *resb* and *daleth* have often been confounded and interchanged in the Syriac as well as in the Hebrew; and the Syriac version has been very incorrectly edited in all the Polyglotts.—Yet it is possible that the Syr. translator might read חֶסֶדֶם in his Hebrew copy: whether that were the original reading, or a blunder of the copyist. From חֶסֶדֶם the Portuguese *perola*, and the Italian and Spanish *perla* (whence the French and our *perle* and *pearl*), might readily be derived.—Be this as it may, both Arabs understood the word to signify a *pearl*: for they render it by لؤلؤ or لؤلؤ, which decidedly has that meaning—and, what is remarkable, the Greek of Venice has also μαργαρίτας.

In the Sam. version the word is rendered חֶסֶדֶם in Gen. and חֶסֶדֶם in Num.: but what either of these signifies, is altogether uncertain.—The Persic has, in both places, בלור which the Latin translator renders, in Gen. *bdellium*; in Num. *crystalum*. So much for the ancient versions.

In the present Masoretic text there has been found no diversity of reading: but 2 Sam. mss. in Gen., and 1 in Num. have חֶסֶדֶם with an *bé*: but this is most probably an oversight of the scribe. If it were the true reading, it would favour Huet's derivation from חֶסֶד; and we should then get rid of one of those *quadriliterals*, which so much puzzle etymologists.—I am willing, however, to believe that the original term is חֶסֶדֶם or חֶסֶדֶם; and that it is an exotic word; to

be

be found perhaps in some Persian or Armenian dialect: although I cannot find it in any lexicon.

If the antient translators were so much divided about the meaning of בדולח, we need not be surprised, that the moderns are not agreed.—The greater part, from Pagninus downward, are for *bdellium*: some few for *crystal*: Deodati alone, I think, for the *pearl*;—and that only in his French version; for in his Italian he has *bdellio*.

The *pearl* was adopted by Bochart, and strenuously defended in his Hierozon. vol. ii. b. 5. ch. 5. to which I refer the curious reader who delights in accumulated erudition and ingenious conjecture. One thing detracts from the force of Bochart's arguments; namely, his grounding them chiefly on the supposition that Havila lay on the Persian gulf, celebrated for its pearl-fishery.—The same system, for the same reason, was adopted by Huet: but this system being now universally scouted, the meaning of בדולח must be made out to be a *pearl* by other arguments. Now the strongest argument in favour of the *pearl*, that I have found, is a passage of Benjamin Tudelensis; which, as the book is rather rare, I shall give in his own words. On his arrival at *Katiph*, or *Elkatiph* (a maritime town on the Persian gulf about six days journey from Bassora), he says, שם ימצא הבדולח ובארבע ועשר בנים ירד שם ספר על פני הים ומבלי המטר ודגא ומסרים ונפלין לתוך קרקע הים. ובתצ תשרי באן שם שני בני אדם לקרקע הים בחבלים ומלקטים את השרץ היםי ומציתן אותם ומבקע אותם ומצאין מתוכם אבנים דלול.

The substance of which is, that in the month of March the drops of rain-water which fall on the surface of the sea, are swallowed by the mothers of pearl and carried into the bottom of the sea; and that these animals being fished for and opened, about the middle of September, are found to contain pearls. It is remarkable that the author uses both the Hebrew name *bedolab* and the Arabic *lulu*, the one at the beginning of his narration, the other at the end of it.

Here, then, is one clear testimony, such as it is, in favour of the *pearl*. It is no objection that the story of the formation of pearls is fabulous: it was generally believed by the antient naturalists that the mothers of pearl were impregnated by celestial dew in the spring of the year. On this fabulous impregnation, a staunch etymologist might make בדולח a compound of בן and דלח, which in Arabic signifies a *cloud teeming with rain*: hence, he might say, the pearl is fitly called *the son of the cloud*. See Castet on the root דלח.

He might next tell you, how *bedolab* came to be changed into *berolab*; namely, by a change of the Hebrew בן into the Chaldee and Syriac בר which equally signifies a *son*: and, then, the derivation of *perola*, *perla*, and *pearl*, is self-evident: for nothing is more common than the intermutation of *b* and *p*.

Another argument in favour of *pearl*, or at least some gem or other, is its being classed with אבן השם which, whether it be the *onyx* or not, is certainly a precious stone of some kind.—But what I have to say on this gem will be found in another place; when I shall have occasion to remark on the stones that composed the breast-plate of Aaron.—Mean time we shall suppose it to be the *onyx*, and its companion to be the *pearl*. But is the *pearl* found in the country bounded by the *Phasis*? or in the Euxine sea into which the *Phasis* runs? That indeed I know not, and wait for information; which most probably I shall never obtain.

The second river, *Gibon*, is said in Genesis to have "bounded the whole land of *Chusb*." But where is this *Chusb* now to be found? Various countries, and at a great distance, one from another, are in Hebrew called *Chusb* חושב. It more generally denotes *Ethiopia*; but the Ethiopians seem to have been only a colony of the original *Chusbit*es who resided in Arabia-Felix. But neither the *Chusbit*es of Ethiopia nor the *Chusbit*es of Arabia can be the *Chusbit*es whose country the *Gibon* bounded: we must therefore look for them elsewhere; and if *Gibon* be the *Araxes*, we must place the land of *Chusb* on that river. Accordingly, Leland finds it in the country of the *Cossæans*, or, as Plutarch calls them, the *Cussæans*, Κουσσαι: which, Strabo says, was divided from Media by the Araxes. The etymon is, doubtless, sufficiently striking: yet Michaëlis is inclined to think that *Chusb* is the חושב * of Abulfeda, formerly the capital of *Chevarazm*, "on the east side of the Gihon," says that Arabic geographer. And Moses Cheronensis, in his history of the Armenians, says, that *Balcha* (בלכא the present capital of that province) is a city of the *Cussæans*. All this would seem to make for the opinion of those, who take the Gihon of Genesis for the Oxus.—Michaëlis even imagines, that the *Sysitani* of Q. Curtius, whom Alexander found nigh to that river, may have been corrupted from *Chusitani*.—But enough of topographical conjecture—Let us return to Paradise.

The part of the paradisaical history, which has most puzzled interpreters, whether allegorists or literalists, is what is said of the *tree of life*, and of the *tree of the knowledge of good and evil*. These two trees are said to have been planted in the middle of Paradise עץ חיים. I know that the word עץ may signify simply *in*; but the context here seems to determine its meaning; they were trees planted in the very centre of the garden †; supposed to be the occasional residence of God himself; as we shall see presently.

But what was the *tree of life*?—According to the Hebrew idiom, any tree, or plant, bearing an wholesome or medicinal fruit, might properly enough be denominated a *tree of life*; as fresh, salubrious, running waters are termed *waters of life*. But the composer of this *mythos* must have had something more in view. His *tree of life* seems to have borne fruit of an extraordinary kind, by which the life of man might be prolonged, and his decaying health from time to time restored ‡—I would not say for ever; for that were absurd; nor is it so much as hinted at by the author: but at least for a much longer time than has since been allotted to man. The delightful garden of Eden would have wanted something, if there had been wanting in it such a salutiferous plant: nor was the fruit of this plant interdicted from man, until after he had eaten the fruit of the *tree of knowledge*: to which we must next turn our attention.

It is called the *tree of the knowledge of good and evil*; that is, in Hebrew phraseology, *every thing knowable*. But why is the fruit of this tree forbidden to man? or, to speak more properly, Why does our author feign such a prohibition?—The question, I think, is not hard to be answered.

* I need not tell the Oriental scholar, that it is usual with the Arabs to change the Hebr. *shis* into *trif*.

† Bene D. J. Pott. "Licet עץ, in medio, pro simplici 2, in, poni solere, ne tironem quidem fugiat; hoc aenigma tamen commodè etiam, ad verbum, in medio horti reddi posse putaverim, ut arbores primariæ primarium quoque locum teneant." Comment. De ant. Documento, p. 38.

‡ For, however perfect he might come from the hands of his Creator, he was liable by his mere mechanical structure to be worn out at last.

It is well known to politicians, that the great bulk of mankind will rarely be kept in strict subordination, unless they be kept in a certain degree of ignorance. Neither the mysteries of state nor the mysteries of religion are to be too narrowly pried into. *Scrutator majestatis opprimetur a gloria*, Prov. 25. 27. I am aware that these words are only in the Latin Vulgate, and correspond not entirely with the original: but the maxim has been often inculcated, and is perfectly consonant with the general idea that mysteries ~~are not~~ to be searched into. Implicit faith and implicit obedience have always been considered, by legislators, as the best preservatives from innovations and revolutions, in church or state: and a prelate of our own nation and days ~~was positively in the right, when he affirmed, that the people have nought to do with the laws, but to obey them.~~ Whether this be a good or bad, a salutary or pernicious maxim; or whether a general diffusion of knowledge produce more evil than good; I am not now examining. A celebrated author of our own time * has treated the subject with much ingenuity, and decided against the spread of science. But that is not here the question. The fact is, that all the antient legislators required a greater or less degree of implicit obedience to their respective laws; and for that purpose feigned an intercourse with some Divinity to make that obedience more palatable to the credulous multitude.

But was this, it will be said, the case with Moses?—Why not? And where is the proof that Moses did not, in this, act like other legislators? This concession, so far from diminishing the character of Moses and the wisdom of his laws, greatly enhances both; and is perfectly compatible with the only *divine inspiration*, which sense and reason can admit—at least, which my sense and reason can admit †.

Indeed, I cannot conceive how Moses could have governed so rude, so stubborn, so turbulent a nation; and made them submit to such a code of laws as he devised for them; without feigning an immediate intercourse with the Deity, and ascribing to Him every injunction laid upon them. If, in spite of this precaution, and in defiance of God, they were constantly murmuring, and rebelling; what must it have been, if Moses had only spoken as from himself?

But although his communications with God were frequent, and almost on every emergency, he was particularly careful to keep the people at a distance from the intercourse. No one must approach the mount, while he is receiving the Decalogue, under pain of death. No one must hear the responses given from the oracle, but through him; no one but he sees God “face to face.”—No one must reason against any of his ordinances; no one object to any of his decisions: because his ordinances and decisions are all from the mouth of God. In a word, the people must have no more religious or political knowledge than he is pleased to parcel out to them, by himself or his brother Aaron, whom he makes his prophet and priest: the rest have nothing to do with the *law*, but to *obey it*.

All this is so clear from the whole history of his legislation, that every reader of any discernment must have been struck with it: but how is all this applicable to the *mythos* I am now explaining? It is perfectly applicable.—If God, on the very creation of man, forbade him to taste of the tree of knowledge, and if disobedience to that precept brought about all the evil.

* Rousseau.

† For, “every good gift, and every perfect boon, cometh down from above, from the father of lights.” Jam. I. 17:

which we now find in the world : how dangerous is it to seek to know more than what God is pleased to communicate ; how impious to search into mysteries above our humble sphere !—In Paradise mankind were ignorant, but they were simple and innocent : so innocent and simple, that “ although they were both naked they were not ashamed :” but no sooner have they tasted of the tree of knowledge, than they are “ ashamed, and hide themselves.”—Who does not perceive the beauty of so well contrived a story ?

We are now come to the last *act* of this mythological *drama* ; man’s transgression, and his consequent expulsion from Paradise : which, let us see, if it be not as well conceived, and as aptly constructed as the rest.

In ~~however~~ happy a state man may have been at first created ; howsoever delightful the first place of his abode ; his present residence is not a paradise, nor his state a state of absolute felicity. “ Man, born of woman, is short-lived, and full of trouble : for all his days are sorrows, and his labour grief : he cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down ! as a shadow he fleeth, and continueth not*.” He is no more placed in a garden of pleasure, that yieldeth its delicious productions without irksome labour ; he must toil and sweat to procure his daily bread ; he is exposed to numberless dangers, liable to various diseases and accidents, has no *tree of life* to repair his broken constitution, and dies at last, for the most part, in agony and pain. These evils are common to man and woman ; but the latter has peculiar ills to lament. The nausea of breeding, the pains of child-bed, subordination to a husband and domestic slavery are her particular lot.

Now, whence all this mass of misery ? Our historian informs us, it arose from the first pair of mankind having violated a divine precept, from an ambitious desire of knowing as much as the Gods !—Are the Gods then jealous of their privileges ?—They have been so represented by the mythologists of every nation.—For the stealth of a single spark of celestial fire, the box of Pandora, replete with manifold evils, was emptied upon the whole earth ! The God of the Jews, *JEHOVAH*, is expressly denominated a jealous God ; “ JEALOUS is his name.” *Exod.* 34. 14. “ With *jealousy* he is clad, as with a cloak.” *Ist.* 59. 17. He will have his people to worship no other Divinity but himself ; he “ visits the sins of the fathers,” in this respect, “ upon their children, unto the third and fourth generation.” *Exod.* 20. 5. Is it surprising, then, that he should be represented by the Hebrew mythologist, as jealous of man’s becoming participant of divine knowledge ; and that the origin of evil should be ascribed by him to that audacious and forbidden attempt ?

But what tempted the first man and woman to violate the precept of God, and taste, in defiance of that precept, the fruit of the tree of *interdicted knowledge* ? Our author says, it was a cunning serpent : our theologians tell us, it was the more artful Devil ! Which are we to believe ?—“ Which are we to believe !” exclaims the man of orthodoxy ; “ why, to be sure, the theologians ; the *infallible* church of Christ.”—But, then, what becomes of the *infallible* word of God ? Let any one, setting aside for a moment his theological prepossessions, read over, and over, the third chapter of Genesis, and say, if he find in the whole narrative a single vestige, a single hint, of any thing like the Devil, or his agency in this transaction ?

* *Job* 14. 1, 2. and *Eccles.* 2. 23.

Indeed, if the Devil had any thing to do there, the narrator is an unfair, disingenuous historian; whether he be supposed to give a real history, or a poetical figment in the garb of history. Nothing can be imagined more absurd than the present story, if the Devil were the real agent in the deception of Heva; but make the agent a real serpent, and every thing is congruous and rational. The history of the fall was either handed down by tradition from the first pair themselves, or revealed to the writer, or invented by him. In any one of these suppositions the interference of the Devil is unaccountable.

For, in the first place, if Adam told the story, as it now is, to Seth; and at the same time knew, that not a serpent, but the Devil in the form of a serpent, or through the organ of a serpent, was the real seducer; he reported the story in a very unfaithful manner; by concealing the most important part of it.

Secondly, if the story came not from Adam, but was divinely revealed to the writer of Genesis, the matter becomes worse; for Adam might not know that the Devil had any thing to do in the business: and in truth he could have no such knowledge, if he heard and saw no more than is reported in the narrative before us: whereas God must have known every circumstance connected with the transaction: yet in the revelation which he is here supposed to make, he is totally silent of the Devil; and blames and condemns the serpent only, as the seducer of mankind. This then is a partial, ambiguous and fallacious revelation, if the Devil were the real seducer.

Lastly, if the story came neither from Adam nor from God, but be, as I think it is, a mythological moral figment; it is a bungling tale indeed, if the Devil have any concern in it. It would have been as easy for Moses, as for Milton, to make the Devil enter into the plan of his drama; and he would, no doubt, have made him act a conspicuous part in it, if he had conceived him to be the principal agent.—He has made him act no part at all! he has given him no share in the seduction! he has not so much as hinted at his existence! and yet we are confidently told that HE was the grand master-wheel of the whole movement!—If ever assertion deserved the name of paradox, this superlatively merits it.

I have said that the writer of Genesis does not so much as hint, that such a personage as the Devil existed: and I am fully persuaded that the writer of Genesis had no idea of such a being as the Devil; who seems to have been totally unknown to the whole Hebrew nation, until the Babylonish captivity. This has, in my apprehension, been so clearly shewn by Eichhorn, that I have little or nothing to add to what he has said; and beg leave to refer my curious readers to his *Essay on Primeval History*, already quoted: especially as I shall have occasion to treat more copiously on the subject in another place.—I hasten to the completion of the mythos.

Ver. 25. *Although Adam and his wife were both naked, yet they were not ashamed.* Simple, innocent pair! ye had not yet aspired at that superior knowledge of good and of evil, which had been interdicted you! ye had not yet wished to become like the Gods! Soon shall ye have cause to repent of your attempt to rival divinity! For,

C H A P. III.

Ver. 1. *THE serpent, who was the most crafty (or knowing) of all the animals of the field, said to the woman, &c.*—Was the serpent, then, a speaking animal, at that period? He was: say the more antient interpreters, both Jews and Christians: or, at least, he was inspired by the Devil to speak on that occasion; as, on another occasion, Balaam's ass was inspired by God!—No, says Abarbanel, and most modern commentators; it was all dumb show, a real pantomime. The serpent, in the sight of the woman, ate of the forbidden fruit, and received no hurt from it: the fruit was otherwise delectable, and knowledge was desirable: so she concluded, that she too might eat, and be safe.

This latter mode of interpretation is, certainly, not incompatible with the oriental style; and in very many cases we must admit it, or admit absurdities. The dialogue between the serpent and Heva, and even between God and Adam, &c. may readily be conceived to have happened in this manner.—The only question is, if, all things considered, the author of this narration is to be understood, as speaking here literally, or tropologically: that is, whether he considers his *serpent* endowed with the gift of language, and uttering articulate sounds, or only expressing by gesture and action what the mythologist clothes in words? Now, I confess, that I am much inclined to think, that the *serpent*, in the view of the writer, is a speaking serpent; and a serpent of a different form from the present serpent.—It must have been a general opinion among the Jews, as late as the days of Josephus, that not only the serpent, but all the other animals, had originally the faculty of speech: ὁμοφώνουσι δὲ κατ' ἐκείνου καιροῦ τῶν ζῴων αἰσχροῦ, ὁ οὖν, συνδιατρώμενος τῷ τε Ἀδάμ καὶ τῇ ὕδατι. κ. τ. λ. Ant. l. 1. c. 4. I see no reason then, why the author of Genesis might not avail himself of that tradition, howsoever fabulous, in his mythological narration of the fall of man.—Be this as it may, the story proceeds thus: “Is it true then, said the serpent, that ye may not eat the fruit of every tree in the garden?—Nay, replied the woman—we may eat of the fruit of every tree but one—but of this one tree we must not taste; we must not touch it, on pain of certain death. No; said the crafty serpent, ye shall not die—God is only jealous of you—he well knows that whosoever ye shall eat of the fruit of that tree, “your eyes will be opened; and that like God himself (or “like gods”) ye will have the knowledge of good and evil.”—Whether this argument be urged in words or actions, it is all the same to the mythos. The argument had its full effect upon the woman: she ate, and made her husband eat also: “their eyes were opened,” that is, their knowledge was increased*; but they were conscious that this acquisition was in direct disobedience to a divine precept; they saw they were naked; and hid themselves among the trees of the garden from the presence of the Lord!—All this is told in so simple, so short, and so seemingly artless a manner; that one cannot help admiring the genius, and judgment, and even the taste that pervade every part of the narrative.

Behold, now, the great catastrophe! In the breeze of the evening, the voice of God is heard in the garden—calling to Adam: “Where art thou?”—“I heard thy voice,” replies affrighted man; “and, being naked, I hid myself.”—“And who,” says God, “hath told thee that

* So Secker, in his *ms. notes*.

"thou art naked? How camest thou to know so much as that? Hast thou eaten of that tree, of which I commanded thee not to eat?"—"I have eaten of it," says Adam: "but that same woman, whom thou hast given me, for a companion, gave it me."—"How camest thou to do this?" says God to the woman.—"The serpent seduced me, and I ate!"

Had God, next, questioned the serpent, as in justice he ought to have done, if the serpent was a mere tool ~~in the hand of Satan~~, the serpent must have been made to reply: "The Devil spoke by my mouth."—But no; the climax rests here; and the doom is pronounced accordingly, beginning by the serpent, not by the Devil: of whom there is not a single sentence, nor a single insinuation.

The serpent, then, and not the Devil, was, in the view of our mythologist, the real seducer of Heva. But what induced the writer to make this choice? Apparently three obvious motives. 1st, The known *craftiness* and *wisdom* of the serpentine race. 2dly, The horror with which the sight of them inspires all other animals. 3dly, The particular enmity and hostility that exists between them and man. Could he have, in the whole creation, pitched upon an animal so proper for his purpose?—The craft and cunning of this singular animal is employed to raise in the mind of weak woman an irregular appetite for an apparently delicious fruit, that is to increase her knowledge. She falls an easy victim to her sensuality and curiosity, and prevails on her husband to share in her crime. They acquire new knowledge, at the expence of their innocence and obedience; are expelled from the garden of delight, condemned to lead a life of labour and affliction, and to die before their day:—and all this because they would aim at a knowledge above their sphere, and taste of a fruit that grew only for the *Gods*! I say *Gods*, because I think it clear from ver. 22. that the writer makes Jehovah to address himself to other *Gods*, inferior Gods, if you will, but still to Gods of some sort; that is, to celestial superiour beings whose occasional residence was Paradise; and where the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was for them reserved. It was the ambrosia of Eden. See the remark on that verse.

Come we now to the respective sentences pronounced against our delinquents. To the serpent God said: ver. 14. "Because thou hast done this, thou shalt be more execrable than any of all the cattle and animals of the field." Which, in my note, I have explained thus: "No animal whatever shall be so odious to mankind, as thou." I am not however sure, that the other rendering "thou shalt be execrable to, or abhorred by, all the cattle," &c. is not a preferable reading. It depends upon the meaning of the preposition *על*, whether it should here be rendered *præ* or *ab*; *above* or *by*.

1b. *On thy belly thou shalt go, and dust thou shalt eat, all the days of thy life.* St. Basil is of opinion that, before this sentence, the serpent was upright: and this appears, to me, to be the case; I mean in the mythos. For I cannot see with what propriety, *creeping on the belly, and eating the dust*, could be a part of the punishment, if it were not a degradation from a prior state. Those who make it no part of the punishment, seem not to be aware, that it is a useless pleonasm.

Ver. 15. *A mutual enmity I will put, &c.* Whether this mutual enmity existed before, is a matter of no consequence. It was enough for the writer's purpose, to observe that it now exists.

Ver. 15. — *between thy seed, and her seed: they shall seek to bruise thee on the head, and thou to bite them in the heel.* So I render the Hebrew; contrary, in one respect, I believe, to almost all modern translators. The difference is in determining the meaning of the words זרע and נחש; that is, whether the word *seed* is to be understood plurally of the whole posterity of Heva, or only of one individual of her posterity, namely, JESUS CHRIST? The great bulk of interpreters render נחש in the singular; by either *he* or *it*; and our common version by both: “*It* shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise *his* heel:” and we are referred, in the concordantial margin, to not less than 18 or 19 passages of the Old and New Testament, for an explanation. Yet it happens, that not one of those passages, so ostentatiously quoted, throws a single ray of light on the subject; nor, in truth, has any concern with it*.

Now I maintain, that neither of the words in question can be properly rendered in the singular number (in any language that has not a neuter gender) without doing violence to the text, and making it absolutely inconsistent with itself. For, in the first place, זרע, σπέρμα, *semen, seed*, are certainly equivalent to *posterity*; and ought generally to be understood and rendered plurally, where there is no particular circumstance to limit the meaning. The *seed* of Heva, then, and her *posterity*, are equivalent terms: and as there is no particular circumstance to limit the word to any one individual of her posterity, it must include her whole posterity.

In the next place, if it did not include her whole posterity, the text would be unintelligible, and the parallelism absurd.—If Jesus Christ were the *one*, and only *one*, of her seed, here alluded to, the whole sentence would be a riddle indeed; a riddle which neither Oedipus, nor Samson, nor Solomon could have solved. For, whose head is he said to bruise, or lay in wait for? The head of the serpent? or of the serpent's seed? Of both, according to the Text; but of neither, according to our Divines, unless the Devil be the seed of the serpent †; as JESUS is the seed of the woman:—Truly, truly, this is a strange interpretation of a text as clear as can be; and which, but for theological prepossessions, would not puzzle the meanest capacity.—Reader! whosoever thou be, who understandest the first elements of the Hebrew dialect, and the first elements of logic, lay aside for a moment thy scholastic prejudices and thy college-dictates, and read over with attention the third chapter of Genesis; and say if thou findest in it any vestige of a seducing *Devil*, or a redeeming *Saviour* ‡?—Thou mayest then turn to Calmet's Commentary, or any other commentary of the same bran; and keep thyself from *laughing*, if thou canst.—But who would not weep, on seeing such critics as Rosenmüller adopting so absurd an hypothesis, and thus paraphrasing ver. 15. “*Inimicitias excitabo inter te et mulierem, inter tuum genus et unum ex mulieris posteritate: hic te proculcabit, licet a te victo mordebitur! Hic enim (adds he) sensus hujus versus esse videtur. In tabula hic-*

* It grieves one to see, how ridiculously our concordantial references have been formed. One would think that the great point in view were, who should accumulate most passages; without regard to their relationship: yet this is called, *Scripture explaining Scripture.*

† I cannot here withhold an excellent observation of Secker, “*If thy seed, says he, be one seed, so must his seed: and how is either the Devil, or all the demons, the seed of the serpent?*” MS. Notes.

‡ Bene Dathé: “*Non faveo illis, qui promissiones de Messia e Vet. Test. detrudere student: sed intrudere eas in loca, in quibus non leguntur, æque ac illud temerarium mihi videtur.*”

“roglyphica hæc picta esse videntur : Serpens major, cum minoribus, symbola Satanae et reli-
 “quorum dæmonum. Vir quidam, Adamo similis, unus ex Evæ posteris, pedibus conterit
 “caput serpentis, a quo in calce inordetur ; symbolica imago Christi morte sua victoriam de
 “Diabolo reportantis. Ex hac igitur hypothefi, hic versus promiffionem de Messia, five *prot-*
 “*evangelium*, continet.”—It is rather furprising that this *protevangelium* or *first-gospel* should not
 have been noticed by future *Evangelists* ; and never ~~appealed to~~ ^{mentioned} by ~~Carm~~ ^{Carm} himself, or
 by his ~~Ap~~ ^{Ap} ~~ostles~~ ^{ostles}. But here I must again refer my reader to Eichhorn, who has handled this
 matter with great ability, and with an irresistible strength of argument. See also Zacchariæ
 Biblioth. Theol. part ii. sect. 124. and Dathe on Genesis.

Before I leave the *serpent*, I have two or three philological remarks to make.

1. The word שָׁרָפ, a *serpent*, is in the printed Sam. Text שָׂרָפ, which signifies a *liar* : “and
 “the woman said to the *liar*, &c.” This is called by Michaëlis and Rosenmüller a various
 reading worthy of notice, *notatu digna lectionis varietas*. It is so little worthy of notice, that
 it is evidently a typographical blunder, rectified by six Sam. mss. * the Hebrew Text, and
 all the antient versions. The error was easily committed. The *capb* and *nun*, in the Sam.
 characters, resemble one another so much, as to be easily interchanged. It is matter of won-
 der, however, that this faulty reading of the Sam. Text did not, in some measure, reconcile
 it to its greatest adversaries ; who at the same time were friendly to the *diabolic* system. “The
 “*Devil* was a *liar* from the beginning,” would have, in that supposition, been perfectly appli-
 cable ; and holden forth with triumph against the *Serpentarians*.

2. The relative נָחִי corresponding with the antecedent נָח, *seed* ; and which I have ren-
 dered *they* ; that is, the woman’s *posterity*, has been the subject of a very serious controversy,
 in latter times, between the Roman Catholic and Protestant interpreters. The Vulgate having
ipsa, the Roman Catholics applied it to the Virgin Mary, protypified in Heva. This was by
 the Protestant party deemed little less than blasphemy, and reprobated in the most bitter terms.
 The Catholics, on the other hand, insisted that the Hebrew Text was corrupted ; and that
 instead of נָחִי we should read נָחִי. A number of Church Fathers were quoted in favour of
 that opinion, from Ambrose and Austin down to Bede and Bernard. But the authority of
 those Fathers will never counterbalance that of the Hebr. and Sam. Texts, supported by all
 the versions, except the Vulgate † ; which itself has been corrupted from some erroneous copies
 of the old Italic : for Jerom every where reads *ipse*. I say from some erroneous copies of the
 old Italic : because Cyprian, and Lucifer of Cagliari, read *ipse* in their copies. See Sabatier.

But how are we to account for *ipsa* getting into the Latin Text at all ? Martianay ac-
 counts for it thus. In antient mss. *ipse* was sometimes written *ipsae* with a diphthong. The
 final *e* was easily dropped ; and left *ipsa* behind.—I should rather think, that among the nu-
 merous Latin versions, that were extant in the days of Austin, some copies might have had
stirpem instead of *femen* ; a word by which Jerom himself sometimes renders נָחִי ; and in
 that case *ipsa* would be the proper relative.—Be that as it will, נָחִי is most undoubtedly

* Rosenmüller mistakes, when he says that six Sam. mss. have this reading : on the contrary, those six mss. have the right, and common reading.

† Several copies of the Vulgate read *ipse*, before the Clementine correction. See a long article on this word, in the Appendix to De Rossi’s fourth vol. of Var. Readings.

the original reading; and cannot be a feminine. It might be rendered in the masculine *he*, if the antecedent were not a neuter: most copies of the Septuagint Greek so render, *αυτος*; and that is the only authority on which *ipse* can be defended. I suspect however that the right reading is *αυτε*, which is still said to be that of some copies*. The oriental dialects, having no neuter, must be understood according to the sense: in all of them the relative corresponds with the antecedent *seed*. The Greek version of Venice has very properly *sauo*.

3. The words *הָשָׁמַר* and *הָשָׁמַרְתָּ* are variously rendered by the ancient translators: but their versions are all reducible to two; namely to *bruisse*, and to *lay in wait for*, *conterere* and *observare*, or *insidiari*. The Septuagint has *τηρησει* and *τηρησεις*†, which the ant. Ital. renders *servabit* and *servabis*; that is, *observabit* and *observabis*. Jerom in the first comma has *conteret*, in the second *insidiaberis*: and this latter seems to be, in both places, the genuine meaning. The other antient versions, however, are either ambiguous, or lean to *conteret*. The Greek of Venice has also *παλῆξαι* and *παλῆξας*.—The original word occurs but in three places of scripture: here, Job 9. 17. and Ps. 139. 11. As both these last may be reconciled to the meaning of *insidiari*, much more easily than to that of *conterere*; I incline to think that the former, or some such word, is the proper signification of *הָשָׁמַר*.—In my version, I have endeavoured to include both meanings.

On the doom of the woman I have nothing to remark; except what has been said in my explanatory note. I will only add Rosenmüller's ingenious explanation of *תְּשַׁקֵּתָךְ*, &c. "*Ad virum tuum cursus tuus. קָרָא* enim est *currere* aut *cursum*: sed quoniam servi circa heros, ut imperata faciant, *cursum* solent, nomen *cursum* translatus est ad *obedientiam* eorum, qui aliis subiecti sunt."

Ver. 17. *Accursed, with respect to thee, be the ground*. Instead of *בְּעִבְרֶיךָ*, *with respect to thee*, or *on thy account*, the Septuagint seem to have read in their copy *בְּעִבְדֶיךָ*, *in thy labours*; and Jerom in the singular, *in opere tuo*: which is no inept reading.

Ver. 18. The addition *thy* before *bread* is only in Sept. and one of De Rossi's mss. by the first hand: yet I have no doubt of its having been originally in the Text. *לֶחֶם* bread, in such like phrases, is rarely without the affix. Comp. Job 20. 14. Ps. 102. 4. al. 101. 5. Eccl. 9. 7. "Eat *thy* bread with joy." And Ezek. "Son of man, eat *thy* bread with quaking," &c.

Ver. 20. I have taken the liberty to transpose this verse to the place where I suppose it originally stood. Whether that supposition be well or ill founded, is of little consequence. The narration is evidently mended by the transposition; and they who dislike it may replace the verse where it was.

Ver. 22. *Lo! Adam—or man—is become like one of us*. If there be any passage in the Old Testament which countenances a plurality of persons in the Godhead; or, to speak more properly, a plurality of Gods, it is this passage. He does not say simply *like us*; but *like one of us* *כְּאֶחָד מֵאֵמָּנוּ*. This can hardly be explained as we have explained *נַעֲשֶׂה* *Let us make*, ch. 1. 26. and I confess it has always appeared to me to imply a plurality of Gods, in some sense or other. It is well known that The *Lord*, or *Jehovah*, is called in the Hebrew scriptures "The God

* See Boe, and the edition of Wechel, 1597. It was the reading of Theophylactus.

† Except the Complutensian edition, which has *τηρησει* and *τηρησεις*.

"of Gods." He is also represented as a Sovereign "sitting on his throne, attended by all "the heavenly host;" in Job called *the Sons of God*; i. e. *Gods*; as *prophets* are called *the sons of the prophets*; and, in Greek, *physicians*, the *sons of the physicians*.—We may readily conceive, then, that some of those Gods, probably angels of the superiour order, would accompany their Sovereign in his supposed excursions to the earth; more especially when he was to hold a court, as we may say, and pronounce judgment on guilty Man. This supposition is perfectly agreeable to other passages of Hebrew scripture: wherever Jehovah is present, whether on Sinai or in Zion, there he is attended by "twenty thousand angels" of the cherubic order. Ps. 68. 17.—When he appeared to Jacob at Bethel, he was attended by angels, Gen. 28. 12. And, when he deigned to wrestle with the same patriarch, he had a whole camp, or camps, of angels at hand. Gen. 32. 1, 30.—To his attendants, then, his courtiers and ministers, he may readily be supposed to have addressed these words: "Lo! Adam is so far become like one of us, as "to know good and evil." He has, in spite of my strict prohibition, dared to taste of a fruit which was reserved for me and my *sons**; and fitted only to our superiour state: let us, at least, prevent him from being like us, *immortal*, by having free access to the *tree of life*. Let him be for ever expelled from this delightful paradise, this garden of the Gods†; and let the avenue to the *tree of life* be guarded by a sentry of cherubs, to prevent him and his offspring from future encroachments on our prerogatives.—Whether the word לעולם, which I have translated *for ages*, was designed by our author to express what we call *eternity*, or only a long period of years; and whether man, if he had not transgressed, was, in the writer's idea, to have been absolutely immortal, or not; I will not take upon me to determine: nor is the question, in my apprehension, of any moment. It is certain that עולם means any long or remote period, anterior or posterior; and corresponds exactly with the Latin *olim*; or, rather, it is the same word.

Ver. 21. *The Lord God made garments of skins, &c.* Some have imagined that these skins were the skins or barks of trees. I see no reason for departing from the common acceptation. Skins were most probably the first garments used; and God is said to make what he teaches man to make. Man, expelled from Paradise, was now to till a ground over-run with *thistles and thorns*, and to be exposed to all the excesses of heat and cold, which, we may suppose, were not known or felt in the garden of Eden: clothing was therefore necessary to defend him from external injuries, as well as to hide his nakedness: and the Lord, pitying his new condition, shows him, that is, gives to him the idea of making garments of skins, instead of an ill-patched waist-girdle of fig-tree leaves.

We have now got to the end of the *mythos* of Moses; or whoever else was the author of the wonderful production. I trust that I have done something like justice to its beauties; and that it will appear, on the whole, to be a well devised, well delineated, well executed piece: nay, that it has not its equal in all the mythology of antiquity: I mean, if it be considered, not as a real history, nor as a mere mystical allegory; but, such as I have throughout exhibited it, a most charming political fiction, dressed up for excellent purposes in the garb of history, and

* I mean, in the sense before mentioned.

† See Gen. 14. 10.

adapted to the gross conceptions and limited capacity of a rude, sensual and unlearned credulous people*.

I have endeavoured to be as brief as possible; nor have I dwelt on any thing that seemed not to be of some importance: yet I fear, that to some readers I may appear to have exceeded due bounds; and it will possibly be said: "If our Remarker goes on at this rate, he will never have done. Three chapters only are yet remarked on; and yet we are at the 50th page of the volume."—Be not alarmed, my good reader! I shall not again have occasion to be so tedious.—Let us commence a new career.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 1. *I HAVE acquired a god-like man-child.* Lit. I have acquired a man-god. The present text, indeed, has, *I have acquired a man, Jehovah*; or *a man, the Lord*: קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֵת יְהוָה and this is the reading of all the antient versions, save the Septuagint, both Arabs †, and the Latin Vulgate, which have *God* instead of the *Lord*. This reading I strongly suspect to be the true one; both because the word יְהוָה was not known to Heva, nor to any of the Patriarchs ‡; and because the word אֱלֹהִים has, in several other places, been changed into יְהוָה by the Jewish transcribers. Indeed, if neither the Greek nor the Arabic, nor the Vulgate §, read אֱלֹהִים, I should still be inclined to deem יְהוָה a spurious lection; and should think that the original word must have been חַיָּה, which would make a sense not only consistent, but perfectly analogous: *I have acquired a living man*: hence well might she be called *Heva*, the *life-giver*.

But supposing אֱלֹהִים *God* to be the true reading, what is here the meaning of אֵת אֱלֹהִים? The Greek translators render it *ἐν θεῷ*, both Arabs *عند الله*, and the Vulg. *per Deum*. And the other translators, who read יְהוָה render אֵת nearly in the same manner; Sam. vers. בְּיְהוָה, Onk. בְּיְהוָה, Perf. בְּיְהוָה, Gr. Ven. *ἐν τῷ θεῷ*.

Most modern translators and interpreters have adopted this mode of rendering; making אֵת an ellipsis for אֵת; as if Heva had said; "Through the favour of the Lord, I have gotten a man-child."—This is specious, but in my opinion more specious than solid. For, in the first place, the few examples that are produced of such an ellipsis, from Gen. 44. 4.—49. 25. Deut. 34. 1. and 2 Kings, 23. 35. are feeble props on which to build an hypothesis. In the first example, the יְהוָה אֵת הַיָּרֵךְ may readily be explained without making אֵת an ablative pre-

* I have transposed verses 20 and 21, and placed them at the end of the chapter; not because I am certain that they stood so originally, but because in their present position they disjoint the narrative; and because, wherever they be placed, they evidently refer to a future period. "Quidquid de occasione nominis (*Heva*) impositi, de tempore dubitari vix potest; nempe in Paradiso hoc minimè factum esse." Dathe. It was not, probably, until Heva became a mother, that she had her new name.—Eichhorn is of a different opinion.

† It is somewhat singular that *Arab. Expon.* has this reading; as he translated from the Hebrew at a much later period than either the Septuagint or Jerom; and who, as he translates very literally, must have read, it should seem, אֱלֹהִים, not יְהוָה, in his Hebrew copy.

‡ See the Rem. on Exod. 6. 3.

§ That the reading of Sep. and Vulg. was the same with that of the Hebrew Text in Jerom's copy, is plain from his not remarking the difference in his *Questions* on Genesis, as he does in ver. 7.

position, as Helvicus has well shown. "Nego ellipsim esse in Gen. 44. 4. sed sicut Latini "dicunt *exire limen*, Terent.; *exire campum*, Statius; *egredi leges*, Tacitus; ita etiam Hebræi יָצְאוּ "וְיָצְאוּ מִן הָעִיר *exierunt urbem*." So indeed both the Septuagint and Jerom render; ἐξελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν—*Jamque urbem exierant*. I shall only further remark, that four of Kennicott's mss. have יָצְאוּ instead of יָצְאוּ.

The second example is a faulty reading: for all the Sam. copies, four Hebrew mss. and almost all the ancient versions read not יָצְאוּ, but יָצְאוּ, which, I am convinced, is the true reading. In the third example there is such a variety of lection, that it is not easy to say, which is the true one: but granting that יָצְאוּ were the true one, it would not follow, that it is an ablative. See Remark on the place.

In the fourth example יָצְאוּ is evidently the sign of the accusative; "he taxed *the* land."

There is not then a single clear example, that יָצְאוּ is ever an ellipsis for יָצְאוּ.—But does not יָצְאוּ simply, sometimes denote the ablative case? and that even in the Pentateuch? I answer, No. It sometimes signifies *with*; as "Henoch walked *with* God,"—"Noah walked *with* God:" but *with* is not properly an ablative preposition. And were it such, it could never be commuted with *from*, or *by the favour of*, or even *with the assistance of*; as any one may easily convince himself, by turning to all the places where יָצְאוּ signifies *with*.—Nay יָצְאוּ itself has never, I believe, the signification here given to יָצְאוּ. It is not יָצְאוּ but יָצְאוּ, that is generally used for *through*, or *by the favour of*: as Ps. 60. 12. "Through God, בְּיָצְאוֹ, we shall do "valiantly." See also Deut. 33. 29. Is. 45. 17. Jerem. 3. 23.—The acute Luther saw this; but, puzzled with the present reading יָצְאוּ, he imagined that Heva thought Cain was the *Lord, the Messiah*, supposed to be promised ch. 2. ver. 15. and he renders accordingly "Ich habe den "mann, den Herrn."—This opinion was adopted by Pellicanus and others; and has been latterly defended by Parkhurst in his Hebrew Lexicon: and Jonathan Ben-Uziel may be said to have preceded them: for, in his Thargum, he renders thus יָצְאוּ לְבָרָא יְת מַלְאָכָא דִּי "I have acquired a man, the angel of the Lord." The Syr. too, has יָצְאוּ לְבָרָא לְשִׁמְיָא which is badly translated in the Polyglott *possedi virum Domino*. For although יָצְאוּ be the sign of the dative, as well as of the accusative, it seems here to be that of the latter: for what is the sense of "I have acquired a man, to the Lord?"—However this be, the Hebrew יָצְאוּ cannot be here understood, but as the sign of the accusative: and, this being the case, we must render with the present text "I have acquired a man, Jehovah," or, reading יָצְאוּ instead of יָצְאוּ, "I have acquired a man, a God," that is, "a god-like man-child." That יָצְאוּ is the genuine original reading is to me clear, not only for the reasons already given, but because יָצְאוּ is never used to denote a human being; although it is often used to denote an angel as the visible representative and messenger of Jehovah; whereas nothing is more common than the application of יָצְאוּ to the human race. "I say: ye even are *Gods*; and all of you children of the Most High." Ps. 82. 6.—Heva must have been struck with admiration, on seeing her first child, so perfectly resembling her husband, who had been created after the likeness of God; and who, in Luke's genealogy of Christ, is said to be "the *Son of God*."—It was therefore natural for her to exclaim: "I have gotten a male child of a god-like form."

Verses 4, 5. I have nothing to add to what I have said in my explanatory note on the sacrifices of Cain and Abel: but that Josephus thus expresses himself: ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ταυτὴν μάλλον ἡδεται

τη θυσίᾳ, τοῖς αὐτομάτοις καὶ κατὰ φύσιν γεγόνοσιν τιμωμένοις, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῖς κατὰ ἐπινοίαν ἀνθρώπου πλεονεκτηῖν κατὰ βίαν πείθουσιν. That is, God is better pleased with the natural growth of the earth, than with that which the avarice of man forces it to produce : and hence it is not improbable that Josephus understood his text, as the Septuagint did in ver. 7, although he has not given us any version of it. Cain did not properly *discriminate* what was to be offered in sacrifice : ὁρθῶς μὴ ἐδίδει.

Ver. 7. *Doth not one, &c.* Of this difficult passage I have, in my explanatory notes, given three different versions, beside my own : I must here review and examine them more minutely.

The first is that of the Septuagint. Οὐκ εὖν ὁρθῶς προσεγενήκης, ὁρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλης, ἡμαρτες ἡσεχμασον* ὡρος σε ἢ ἀποστροφῇ (or ἐπιστροφῇ) αὐτου, καὶ συ ἀρξῆς αὐτου, which in the old Italic version, as quoted by Austin, is thus rendered : "Nonne, si rectè offeras, rectè autem non divides, peccasti? Quisce : ad te enim conversio ejus, et tu dominaberis illius*."

To Vossius, and our Dawson, this translation appeared so satisfactory, that they are astonished we should seek for any other; and I confess, that were there a ל before תָּשָׁא as there is before תָּשָׁא, I should be inclined to acquiesce in their opinion. I have so great a respect for the Greek translators of the Pentateuch, that, although I do not consider them as either inspired or infallible, I am ever unwilling to abandon them without some cogent reason. Let us suppose then that in their Hebrew copy they either read תָּשָׁא or considered תָּשָׁא as equivalent to it; and that, instead of תָּשָׁא, they read לָשָׁא or לָשָׁא; I cannot see how they could have rendered otherwise than they have done. For, in the first place, it is certain that the coactive voice of שָׁא, in construction with an infinitive, must commonly be rendered in the same manner as here: that is, as Parkhurst well expresses it; it denotes the *doing of that action well*, ὁρθῶς, which the infinitive expresses; as לָשָׁא לָשָׁא Καλῶς ἑώρακας, *Thou hast well seen*. Jer. 1. 12.

My two objections to this rendering are; First, that I nowhere else find תָּשָׁא or even תָּשָׁא used to denote *offering a sacrifice*. It is true that תָּשָׁא signifies a *gift, donative, present*; and the offering of Cain is said, ver. 4. to be a *gift-offering*: but then the Hebrew word there is not תָּשָׁא but תָּשָׁא, and which is always used to denote a *donative* or *gift-offering* made to the Lord.—Secondly, What is the meaning of *not rightly to divide*? Bonfrerius tells us: "He doth not rightly divide, who giveth the worst to the Lord, and keepeth the best to himself." I doubt if the squeamish critic will relish this explanation. More rational is the idea of Josephus; that Cain had not properly *discriminated* what things should be offered; and the word used by the Septuagint may be so understood: for διαίρεω is sometimes equivalent to διακρίνω, and the translation quoted from Gregory VII. (in the note below) *dijudices*, would, then, be a more proper version than the *dividas* of Austin.

Having thus done justice to the rendering of the Greek translators; let us see how the other antient interpreters understood the passage. I shall begin by the Latin Vulgate; because it has in this passage been adopted, either in the whole or in part, by almost all modern trans-

* It is very remarkable that Gregory VII. as late as 1081, quotes the first part of this verse nearly in the same manner: "Si rectè offeras, et rectè non *dijudicas*, peccasti:" which is not noticed by Sabatier: but which seems a proof that the Italic version was occasionally used by the writers of the Latin Church much longer than is generally imagined. See Greg. Epist. lib. 9. ep. 24. apud Labbe Concil. Gen. tom. 10. p. 294.

lators. “Nonne, si benè egeris, recipies? sin autem malè, statim in foribus peccatum aderit? “Sed sub te erit appetitus ejus, et tu dominaberis illius.” Which the Doway translators thus render into English: “If thou doe wel, shalt thou not receive again? but if thou dost il, “shall not thy sinne forthwith be present at the dore? But the lust thereof shall be under thee; “and thou shalt have dominion over it.” Where they subjoin a long note against the *heretical translation* of our latter* English Bibles; and in favour of *free-will*; which, they think, is clearly implied in the words *sub te erit appetitus ejus, &c.* And, indeed, they can hardly bear any other meaning, as they stand in the Vulgate. That this was the meaning of Jerom† is clear from his paraphrase of the words, in his *Questions on Genesis*: “Quod si malè egeris, illico “peccatum ante vestibulum tuum sedebit, et tui janitore comitaberis: verum, quia liberi arbitrii es; moneo ut non tibi peccatum, sed tu peccato domineris.”

Jerom seems to have borrowed the first part of his version from Theodotion's *οὐκ, αὐ ἀγαθῶς ποιῆς, δεκτόν καὶ, αὐ μὴ ἀγαθῶς ποιῆς, ἐπὶ θυρᾷ ἁμαρτία ἐγκαθίσταται*. But he abandons him in the second part: for Theodotion follows, in other words, the sense of the Septuagint *πρὸς σε ὀμνῇ αὐτὴ, καὶ ἀρξέῃς αὐτὴν*. Theod. apud Montefalc. where there is a misprint *ἐγκαθίσταται* for *ἐγκαθίσταται*.

The Syriac version has a singular reading in the last member of the verse. Instead of making Cain subdue sin, it makes sin-subdue Cain: unless the translator meant to say, that *Abel* and not *sin* should have dominion over *Cain*: of which sense indeed his version is susceptible *אמת תרפנא לזמא דח נשורלש בך*.

Both Arabs, and the Chaldee paraphrasts (for Onkelos, here, is as wildly paraphrastic as Jonathan) seem to have understood the Text, although allegorically, in much the same manner as Jerom.—And the Greek version of Venice renders the first part of the verse like the Vulgate; but the last like the Septuagint, *πρὸς σε δ' ἡ σφραῖς αὐτῶν, (not αὐτῆς) σὺ τ' ἀρξέῃς αὐτῶν*.

With respect to modern translators, those even who translated from the Hebrew have generally followed the Vulgate; with the variation of a word or two; namely *venia*, or *condonetur*, for *recipies*; and *pœna* for *peccatum*. So, with others, Houbigant: “aderit in foribus “pœna:” i. e. the punishment due to sin will immediately follow it; *culpam pœna premittit comes*. The punishment of sin lying at the sinner's door, then, is a very intelligible metaphor; and makes this part of the verse run smoothly enough: but how shall the punishment's *desire be subject* to the sinner? and how shall he *have dominion over it*? The two parts of the sentence are thus set at variance; and the whole thereby rendered, to me, unintelligible.

* I say *latter* English Bibles: for all our translations from Tyndal's to the Bishops' Bible (Coverdale excepted) follow the meaning of the Vulgate. I shall give that of Cranmer's Bible as the most explicit of all. “Unto thee also “pertaineth the lust thereof; and thou shalt have dominion over it.”—But the Geneva translators changed it into *his*; and rendered “also unto thee *his* desire [shall be subject] and thou shalt rule over *him*: which version was equivalently adopted by James's translators; but rejected by Gell in his *Essay toward the Amendment of the last Translation of the Bible*, p. 35.

† I must here remark, that Jerom's own version differs in some words from that of the Vulgate, thus: “Nonne, si “benè egeris, demittetur tibi? et si non benè egeris, ante fores peccatum tuum sedebit? Et ad te societas ejus: sed tu “magis dominare ejus.” *Quest. Hebr. in Gen.*

Grotius, whose superior penetration and judgment could not but perceive something uncouth and perplexed in the passage, imagined that a parenthetical distinction would set all right. "Repetendum ex eo quod præcessit: *si bene egeris*: ut sensus sit, si bene egeris, Abelis voluntas tuo imperio subjecta erit, ut fratris minoris; ita illa, *sin autem male*, &c. erunt dicta *παρεσβητικως*, quæ in his libris multa occurrunt."—Parentheses are indeed frequent in the Hebrew writings: but I very much doubt if there be any of this stamp.

Le Clerc saw this, and tried to remove the perplexity by separating, with the LXX, *לפתח*; and rendering: "Nonne, si benè te gesseris, dignitatem tueberis? sin autem benè te non gesseris, peccatum est ad fores? Quisce; et cursus ejus [Abelis] erit ad te; tuque ei dominaberis." This is not only ingenious, but founded on grammatical analogy: and I find it adopted by some latter interpreters. Yet *sin lying at the door*, which he retains from the Vulgate, lies so heavy on my stomach, that I cannot digest it: for the following reasons.

1. If one have already sinned, how can sin be said only to lie at his door, "crouching like a monster," as Le Gros expresses it*; when he has already entered and devoured his prey? A conscientiousness of guilt might, with some propriety, be said to lie at the sinner's door: but then he would not be desired to subdue it: on the contrary, he would be desired to yield to its admonitions.

2. The construction of *לפתח*, a masculine with a feminine, is at least unusual; and, I think, altogether ungrammatical. I know that Jerom makes *לפתח* a masculine; and asserts that the Greek translators erred for want of attention to this. "Quod autem in Septuaginta interpretibus fecit errorem, illud est: quia peccatum, i. e. *ATTATH*, in Hebræo, generis masculini est, in Græco, feminini."—No, learned father! the Greek translators were not deceived: they did not consider *ATTATH* as a feminine at all: they took it for what it is, the 2 pers. masc. of the verb *לפתח*; and, consequently, *ἀποστροφῇ αὐτοῦ* could have no relation to *ἡμαρτία sin*; but to *Abel*; as Cyril and Chrysostom † rightly understood it; and which is now generally allowed to be the meaning, by those even who adhere to Jerom's version, in what precedes ‡.—But is there not one example, at least, beside this, of *לפתח* in the masculine gender, namely Amos 5. 12., where *לפתח* is in construction with *עצמים*? It is so; but the circumstance is singular. The writer had just before used *רבים פשעים* both masculines: it

* Or, as Rosenmüller: "Prava concupiscentia infidiatur tibi, quemadmodum solent bestie præ cubile jacentes prætereuntibus infidiari."

† See this father's elegant paraphrase and explanation of the whole passage in his 18th Homily on Genesis.

‡ The manner in which the Benedictine editor of Jerom explains and justifies that father is perfectly ridiculous. "Nescio (says he) an aliquis, ante nos, hunc Hieronymi locum lectori exposuerit. Observat igitur S. Doctor, quod multo alias in Hebræo, quam in LXX translatoribus, sensus est: causamque erroris apud LXX positam esse dicit in voce Hebr. *ATTATH*, vel *HEATTATH*; quæ peccatum significat, et est generis masculini apud Hebræos; quum *ἡμαρτία* sit gen. fem. apud Græcos: cui nihilominus verbo responderet relativum masculinum *αὐτοῦ*: et hoc ipsissimum est, quod docet Hieronymus, dicens: *Et qui interpretati sunt* (nempe LXX) *masculino illud, ut erat in Hebræo, genere transfugerunt*. Quamvis enim LXX translators verbum Hebr. *HEATTATH* legerint in 2 pers. masc. sing. præter. *ἡμαρτες*: consequenter tamen, addentes *προς οὗ τὴν ἀποστροφὴν αὐτοῦ*, peccatum intelligunt; illique relativum masc. *αὐτοῦ* adungere studuerunt juxta Hebræum affixum masc. quod respondet vocibus *HEATTATH* Roberts: i. e. *peccatum cubans*."—All this is *gratis dictum*—a double *petitio principii*; and a misapprehension of Jerom besides, with respect to the words *Et qui interpretati sunt*, &c. which relate not to the LXX but to the other Greek translators—as every acute reader must see at the first glance.

was, therefore, natural to place **עצום** also in the masculine; although the following word was in the feminine. This is only a *syllipsis generum*, not uncommon in other languages; and cannot be brought as a proof that **חטאת** is a masculine noun.—It is further observable, that **חטא**, in the masculine gender, is often used to express *sin*, as well as **חטאת**: hence, from the association of ideas, a masculine adjective might occur to the writer, amidst so many other masculines; and, indeed, be no solecism against the idiom of the language.—It will be urged, perhaps, Why do I not allow the same licence with respect to the singular **חטאת** in the text before us? I answer, Because it is not so circumstanced, nor in a similar construction; and because, if it were a real *masculine*, it would not make a tolerable sense, connected as it is with **רצץ**, and **לפתח**. For,

3. The genuine Hebrew mode of expressing *at the door* is not **לפתח**, but simply **פתח**, and sometimes **פתחה**. The words **לפתח** and **פתח אל** signify *to, unto, and for the door*: but never *at the door*.—I say never; because the exceptions are so few, that they scarcely deserve to be mentioned. In the Pentateuch, where the phrase so frequently occurs, there is but a single example, Num. 11. 10.; and even there 3 mss. have the usual reading **פתח**: and, in the whole body of Hebrew scripture, there are, I think, but two more; namely, Josh. 8. 29. and Prov. 9. 14., in both which places the meaning is ambiguous, and may have a greater latitude than *just at or by the door*: they may denote any place without the door; although not at a great distance from it: not to mention that, here also, there is some variety of lection.

4. The true meaning of **רצץ** is not *to couch*, as if lying in wait for prey: even when it is applied to beasts of prey. Thus Gen. 49. 9. “Judah! like a lion, from the prey thou returnest—” when, like a lion, he *quietly coucheth*, who shall rouse him from his rest?”—So Psal. 104. 21, 22. “The young lions (in the night-time) roar after their prey—but as soon as the sun is risen, they lay themselves down, to rest, **ירצצו** in their dens.” And Isaiah 11. 16. “The leopard shall lie down **ירצץ** with the kid.”—The same prophet, 14. 30. saith: “The needy shall lie down **ירצצו** in safety.” And Zophaniah, speaking of the remainder of the Israelites, saith: “They shall feed, and lie down **ירצצו**, and none shall make them afraid.”—In Hiphil also, or the coactive voice; Ps. 23. 2. “He maketh me lie down **ירצצני** in verdant pastures.” In Prov. 24. 15. **רצץ** is the *rest, or resting-place* of the righteous: and **רצצו** in Jerem. 50. 6. is used in the same sense.—In short, there is not an instance, where **רצץ** is taken in the sense here assigned to it: but it always denotes *rest and tranquillity*; except when it is applied to the mere *falling down* of under a burthen, or through fear; as in the instance of Balaam’s ass.

On the whole, then, Jerom’s version, with all the improvements that have been made on it, is, in my apprehension, more objectionable than that of the Septuagint.

Some moderns have tried to mend the matter, by rendering **חטאת** neither *sin*, nor *punishment*; but a *sin-offering*: as if God had said, Is not a *sin-offering* at the door; that is, *at hand*, to atone for the evil thou hast done? But this rendering is liable to the same objections with the preceding ones: I therefore now come to my

Own Version; in order to justify which I must observe, first, that, from the context, we naturally expect a contrast, or antiparallelism; I mean the different consequences of having done *well*, and *ill*.—Secondly, the word **חטאת**, without a prefix, either always, or almost always, de-

notes *elevation, dignity, confidence* *. we must therefore look, in the following comma, for a word denoting the contrary; *depression, dejection, confusion*. Now I find that precise signification in the word *לפת*. For although in Hebrew it occurs but seldom, and in a lax and ambiguous sense, its meaning is sufficiently clear in the Arabic; in which it denotes the very thing wanted, *aversion, depression, contortion of countenance*.—Without changing a letter in the text but one, a *ח* into a *ה*, I read and distinguish thus: *וְהָאֵם תִּיטֵב שְׂמֵתָּ וְהָאֵם לֹא תִיטֵב* which may be literally rendered: “Nonne, si benè feceris, *elevatio*? si vero non benè feceris, *dejectio*? Peccastine? Quiesce: nam, &c.”—The learned reader will observe, that I have detached the *ח* (changed into *ה*) from *לפתח* and prefixed it to the following word; which, in my opinion, gives a beauty and energy to the whole sentence; and is perfectly consonant with Hebrew phraseology. We meet with a very similar phrase in the book of Ecclesiasticus, chap. 21. 1. *Τὸν υἱόν σου, ἡμῶντες; ἢ μὴ πεποιθὲς ἡμῶντες.* “Son! hast thou sinned? do so no more:” which in the original Hebrew (for the Greek is only a translation) must have stood thus: *בְּנִי דַחֲמָתָּ לֹא תִדַּחֲמָתָּ עוֹד* See Isa. 23. 12. and Zophan. 3. 11.

I might have kept to the probable reading of the Septuagint *לפתח*, without any other change at all; and still translate as I do: for *לפתח* may signify *depression of countenance* as well as *לפתח*, and the interrogative *ה* is often suppressed; as in this case it would be before *דַּחֲמָתָּ*. But as *ח* is more easily changed into *ה* than *ת*, and has been often so changed, I prefer the reading above.—At any rate, I am convinced that I have given the true meaning of the text. Let others judge for themselves.

But why, it will possibly be said, have I translated in the third person “Doth not one,” &c.? I answer, Because it is more agreeable to the English idiom—at least so I think;—and, consequently, more expressive of what is meant to be conveyed. It is well known that, in Hebrew, the third person is often used where we use the second; and the second where we use the third. In all such cases the sense, and not the idiom, should be rendered.

Ver. 8. *Let us walk out into the fields, נִלְכֶּה וְשָׂדֵה*. These words are wanting in the present Hebrew text; but are in the Sam. text and version; the LXX, the Syriac, the Vulgate, and in both the Thargums of Jonathan; yet our sticklers for the integrity of the Hebrew text will have them, forsooth, to be an interpolation: although they appear absolutely necessary to connect the sentence. For how bald is the sentence without them! “Cain said *יֵאמֶר* to his brother Abel—and when they were in the fields,” &c. What said Cain? Nothing at all!—Nay, but, (say Hottinger and his numerous party) the word *יֵאמֶר* is here equivalent to *יִדְבֵּר*. Be it so: “And Cain spoke to his brother Abel—and when,” &c. What spoke he? Still, nothing at all.—The example adduced by De Rossi from Exod. 19. 25. “*Descenditque Moses ad populum, dixitque ad eum,*” &c. *quin subjiciatur quid dixerit*; is evidently not to the pur-

* This has been seen by the best modern interpreters; among the first of whom I believe is Diodati in his French version: “Si tu fais bien, n’y aura-t-il pas exaltation?”—So Michaëlis: “Ist es nicht wahr, wenn du gutes thust, so kannst du die augen in die höhe heben.”—And Dathe: “Nonne, si benè feceris, capite erecto potes incedere?”—It is strange, to me, that this did not lead them to examine more minutely the next comma: which if they had done, I am persuaded that they would (absit verbo invidia) have lighted on my conjecture.

pose. There was no need of subjoining what he said; as it had been told before in the preceding verse what he was to say: and we agree with De Rossi that the Vulgate has rightly, *omnia nuntiavit eis*. He told them, what God had told him.

Michaëlis thought we should read *אמר* from *אמר* *amarus*; as if we should say *amarus fuit animo*: but in order to have that meaning it should be rather *אמר*. Dathe imagines that the word *אמר* may be understood to mean, as in Arabic, *to speak harshly*: *Durè locutus est Cainus cum fratre suo*.

Delgado, an ingenious Jew of the present day, transposes the parts of the verse thus: "And it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain talked with Abel his brother, and Cain rose up," &c.

Such is the manner in which the integrity of the Hebrew text has been attempted to be defended, with respect to this passage.—But why so much useless and impotent labour? when the chafin is so well filled up by the Samaritan copy and the most antient versions; and where the more candid Jews themselves acknowledge something to be wanting. "There are, says R. Immanuel (apud De Rossi), who say, that Cain said to Abel: 'Let us go out into the fields' *נצא השדה*, which is equivalent to the *נלכה השדה* of the Samaritan.—Nay, in 27 MSS., and in nearly 40 printed editions, a vacant space, smaller or greater, is left in the Hebrew text where these very words should come in. I know that a still greater number of MSS. have no such vacant space: but that is a poor argument against the authority of Sam. Sep. Syr. Vulg. the Thargums, the context and common sense.

Ver. 10. *The voice of thy brother's blood crieth*, *קול* so Sam. and all the antient versions*; save Onkelos and the Thargums; who seem to have read with the present Heb. *קול*, corresponding not to *קול* but to *קול*. Those who prefer this reading may translate with Delgado: "The voice of thy brother's blood, crying from the ground, *is come to me*." But the other is more natural; and needs no supplemental italics.

The punishment inflicted on Cain is double. The ground where his brother's blood was shed is rendered barren with respect to him; to his toil it shall not yield its product. Adam had been condemned to "eat his bread in the sweat of his face:" but Cain's sweat shall not be able to procure him bread on the soil by him contaminated. This is the precise idea which the antient Greeks had of wilful murder. Sterility and famine were the usual consequences. See Sophocles's Oedipus Tyran. 24 et seq.—Secondly, he is doomed to be "a restless fugitive," an exile from his natal spot; which was by the antients accounted the greatest punishment which the gods could inflict. See a beautiful passage of Euripides, put in the mouth of Orestes, in Iphigen. in Taur. quoted by Grotius in his Commentary; and whose elegant Latin version of it I shall here lay before my reader:

Furiarum impetu
Agitabar exsul, patrio extorris solo:
Multoque flexus cursum implem, miser;
Cum te rogavi, quomodo finem assequi
Possem vagi furoris et cruciatuum
Quos, Græcæ omnis terminos obiens, tuli.

* Even the Arabic of Erpenius and the Greek of Venice, both literal versions from the Hebrew.

See also Sophocles in the tragedy already mentioned, ver. 833.

... .. εἰ μὲ χρη φυγῇ,
Καὶ μοι φυγόντι μῆτε τῆς ἐμῆς ἰδέν,
Μητ' ἐμβάταναι πατρίδος—

Ver. 13. *My punishment is too great to be borne.*—It sometimes happens that a translator, at least to me it has happened, is doubtful, which, of two readings that present themselves, is the more proper one.—The word *πῦ*, which I render *punishment*, more frequently denotes *perversefness*, or *iniquity*: and in that sense it seems to have been understood here, by all antient interpreters: Sep. *אֲשָׁמָ**, Syr. *ܐܫܡܐ*, Onk. *אשם*, Arab. Pol. *أشمة*, Arab. Erp. *أشمة*, Pers. *آشمة*, Vulg. *iniquitas*. Gr. Ven. *ἀμπλακμία*: and, in this, they have been implicitly followed by the bulk of modern commentators; among whom our English translators, before James's; which last adopted the version of Junius and the French of Geneva; and threw the common one into the margin.

As this common rendering makes Cain talk like a person in despair; and has often been quoted, by preachers and polemics, as the first instance of that crime; some more charitable interpreters have tried to soften the expression, by rendering interrogatively: “Is my sin then too great, to be forgiven?” So Michaëlis in his German version, “Ist meine schuld zu groß, als dafs sie vergeben werden könnte?”—But as no copy has been found with the interrogative præfix; and as all the antients seem to have read positively †; I would not readily admit this version.—Obliged, however, to make a choice, and after having considered the texture and construction of the passage, I have preferred the meaning given to *πῦ* and *אשם* by Aben-Ezrah, Oleaster, Piscator, Calvin, Diodati, Junius, and our last translators; both because it is more natural in itself ‡, and because it corresponds better with the context than any other: “My punishment is too great to be borne: for, lo! thou now exilest me,” &c.

Ver. 14. *It will happen, that whosoever may meet with me, will kill me.* I have observed, in my explanatory note, that, according to Josephus, Cain was afraid of the wild beasts: and this idea was adopted by Michaëlis. I cannot think that the text bears any such meaning. Cain was afraid that some of Abel's offspring (for there is no proof that Abel had no children), or one of his own brothers (for Adam had more sons than Cain, Abel and Seth), would retaliate on him; and demand his blood for that of Abel: especially when removed “from the presence of God,” that is, from the spot where Adam resided §; which, being in the neighbourhood of Eden, was, according to the Hebrew theology, more immediately under the eyes of the Divinity: who is still made to converse, now and then, with mankind: even in the silver and brazen ages: as we shall see throughout the whole Jewish history, unto the Babylonish captivity; although much less frequently than in the patriarchal and Mosaic ages.

To free Cain from the apprehension of being killed, God replies, ver. 15. “Not so;” *כֹּן* *לֹא*. for so I read with Sep. Syr. Theod. Sym. and Vulg.—The present text, in both Sam. and Heb. copies, has *כֹּן*, which our translators render *therefore*: but I think, with Dathe, that *כֹּן* can-

* One of Holmes's mss. has *ἀμαρτία*; and so it is quoted by Origen and Theodoret.

† I own this alone would not be a sure argument: it is only a presumptive one.

‡ A very similar phrase occurs in the *Ajax* of Sophocles 1306. *το γὰρ ποσῆμα μείζον ἢ φέρειν*.

§ “In domo paterna fortasse tutus fuisset; sed cum ex ea ejiceretur, utique vindictam poterat metuere.” Rosenmüller.

not be here rendered *therefore*: "Quia Deus respondet ad præcedentem Caini sermonem: neque satis aptè per particulam affirmandi *sane*, *utique*; quam significationem interdum habet."—Houbigant renders "Omnino, is qui Cain interficiet," &c.

"Not so; whosoever killeth Cain shall incur sevenfold vengeance." This was a most wise warning: especially in the infancy of population. Had the sanguinary law of talion been allowed in this instance, it might have ended in the destruction of the whole race.

The most ingenious Eichhorn, in the tract already quoted, endeavours to shew, that this colloquy between God and Cain is all ideal; and only indicates the effects and consequences of Cain's guilty conscience: and I deny not, that this explanation is not at all incompatible with the oriental mode of writing. I am, however, inclined to believe that the writer meant to impress on the mind of his reader a real conversation; although that conversation may never have happened. What I have said of the *Creation*, and the *Fall*, is equally applicable to the story of Cain.

Ver. 15. *And the Lord gave a token of security to Cain.* The common translation is: "The Lord set a mark upon Cain." The original cannot admit of this interpretation. For there is not a single passage in the Bible where מָטָה signifies a *mark* or *brand* set on one. It always denotes a *sign*, a *token*, a *wonderful event*: but never a *mark* *. And although מָטָה signifies to *place* or *set*; it has often a meaning like that of נָתַן; and מָטָה שָׁם is here equivalent to נָתַן שָׁם; and such is its signification wherever it is connected with the word מָטָה. See Psal. 74. 4.—78. 43.—105. 27. and Isa. 66. 19.

The Septuagint version, which has *σημα*, seems to have misled all the rest: although I am not sure but itself has been misunderstood. Certain it is that Cyril of Alexandria thought *σημα* here equivalent to *δεδωκεν*, or read the latter in his copy: *αλλα δεδωκεν (φησιν) ο θεος σημειον τω Καϊν*. Glaph. l. 1. tom. 1. p. 17.—Josephus indeed and the Syr. version are clear for a *mark*. The former has *σημειον επιβαλων, ως γνωριμος ου ειη*. The latter בָּקָן מָטָה נָתַן לוֹ, and so nearly the other versions down to the Greek of Venice. Save that both the Arabs and Vulgate may bear the explanation which I have given; and which I am satisfied is the only true one. Purver, Bate, Dawson, and Dathe concur with me. The version of the last is: "Deinde, signo quodam coram Caino edito, eum certiores fecit, quod nem o, qui fortè in eum incideret, eum esset interfectorus."

The genealogy, through six generations, from Cain to Lamech, seems to have been introduced by the Hebrew historian, for the purpose of noticing the first supposed polygamist; and his sons; who are said to have been the inventors of certain arts. The speech of Lamech to his wives comes in so abruptly, that there is reason to suspect that something has been lost, or forgotten, in the traditional story. Many remarkable sayings have been preserved in every language, long after that which gave rise to them is no more known. Were I to venture a conjecture, I should say, that in all probability Lamech's polygamy was considered as an usurpation upon

* It is truly ridiculous to hear commentators gravely disputing about the nature of this supposed *mark*. Rabbi Jarhi says it was one of the letters of God's own name imprinted on his forehead. Another Rabbi fixes on it a horn. Others tell us that a dog (no doubt a black one) went always before him. The generality of Christian interpreters think the *mark* was a universal tremor, with a frightful ferocious air. Some indulged him with the sign of the cross—and Le Clerc (which is rather astonishing) makes it only a change of clothes. "Insigni aliqua veste testum incedere jubet Deus."

Cyril of Alexandria gives another turn to the passage, although he understands the word *ελπις* as I do. According to him, the title *God* was conferred on Enos, on account of his superior sanctity. *Ελπισε τοιων ενως κληθεσθαι, παρ' ετερων, επ' ονοματι Κυριου του Θεου αυτου τουτ' επι Θεος. Επειδαν γαρ η ουκ. αθαναστος τοις της οσιότητος επρεπων αυχημασι, θεον υπομαζον αυτον των επιεικεστερων ταχα που τινες, τη υπερτατη τιμη στεφανουν ηρημενοι.* Glaph. l. i. vol. 1. p. 23.

They who are for retaining the present Hebrew reading *IN*, are generally of opinion, with Le Clerc, that the meaning of the sentence is: Then Seth's posterity began to be denominated from God; i. e. they were called God's children; to distinguish them from the children of men, or Cain's posterity. But this is asserted without proof, or probability. See the Remark on chap. 6. ver. 2.

Others render: "Then men began to call on the name of the Lord God," that is, to invoke and worship him—a still less probable rendering.

Others: "Then was profaned the name of the Lord God;" i. e. then began idolatry. So most of the Jewish interpreters as far back as the days of Jerom. "Plerique Hebræorum arbitrantur, quod tunc primum in nomine Domini, et in similitudine ejus, fabricata sint idola." Q. in Gen.—In fact, Onkelos, the Thargums, Aben-Ezrah, Jarbi, &c. are of that opinion. And so Houbigant: "Tum primum cœpere homines Dei nomine appellari."

C H A P. V.

IT is clear that this chapter should begin at ver. 25. of the preceding one; according to the sectional division which I have made in my version; which, I am happy to find, meets with general approbation. There is little more, in it, to remark upon. It contains a genealogy of names from Adam to Noah: and, in this genealogy, there is a difference of 100 years between the Hebrew and Greek chronology, with respect to the births; but the sums total of the ages are the same; except in the age of Lamech. There is also some difference between the Hebrew and Samaritan exemplars; which may be seen in the Various Readings. The time to discuss their respective credibility is not yet come: the subject will make a part of my General Preface.

Ver. 22. *Enoch—lived a godly life.* Literally, *walked with God.* *וַיִּתְּךָ אֶת אֱלֹהִים*; which the Greek translator renders *εὐπρεπῆτος τῷ Θεῷ.* Syr. *לְאֵלֵהוּ שָׁפָר*, *was well pleasing to God.* So, equivalently, both Arabs. Onkelos: *walked in the fear of God.* Vulgate: *ambulavit cum Deo.* Tharg. and Perf. *did all that the Lord commanded.* The Gr. of Venice, *πεπαυται ἐν τῷ Θεῷ.*

It is a pure orientalism; and is well explained by Wilkins in his notes upon the *Heetopades*. It is called *taking the staff*; that is, renouncing the cares of the world, and retiring from society into the wilderness, to lead the life of a Brahma-Charee; literally, *one who walketh in God.* The ceremonies of taking the staff, he tells us, are fully explained in the 2d chapter of the Laws of Manoo. See his notes 58, 59, and 378.—Hence I now think that in

Ver. 24. where Enoch is said to have *disappeared*; literally, *was not* *אֵינוּ*; and that *God took him away* *כִּי לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים*; the meaning is not a translation from this world to Paradise; but either

either simply a retirement from society; by which a man is said to be lost to the world and his friends; or a premature death, that he might not be corrupted by the contagion of the world: as the author of the Book of Wisdom has beautifully expressed it: Because he pleased God, and was beloved of him, . . . he was *taken away* *μετέστη* . . . that wickedness might not alter his understanding, nor deceit beguile his soul. *Wisd.* 4. 10, 11.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, indeed, says, that Enoch was *translated*, so as *not to see death*, *οὐ μὴ ἴδῃ θάνατον*: and those who deem every sentence of that epistle of divine authority, will, consequently, reject my explanation: and they are welcome so to do. I will only say with Drusus, that it cannot be proved from the text of Genesis, that Enoch died not like other men. "*Ambulavit* (inquit) *cum Deo, et non fuit, quia tulit eum Deus.* Audio, "*non fuisse*; non audio, *vivere.* Audio, *sublatum esse*; non audio *vivum esse* in paradiso, aut "*in cælo.*—*Tolli etiam dicitur, qui mortuus: ut, tolle animam meam a me; et, in medio dierum* "*meorum ne tollas me.*"

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 2. *THE sons of the gods*, *בני האלים*. Another stumbling-block to interpreters, which, perhaps, will never be removed.—Who are those *sons of the gods*; or, as the words will bear to be rendered, *sons of God*? Josephus, Philo, and the more early Christian fathers imagined that the *sons of God* were angels or aerial beings, who, charmed with the beauty of the daughters of men, found means to violate them; from which commerce sprang a race of lawless giants, or heroes, who corrupted the earth.—Although this idea has been exploded by more recent commentators, it is not without plausibility. I mean, that it is very possible that the writer of Genesis may have had that belief. It seems to have been a prevalent opinion among the ancient nations, that the gods had occasionally carnal commerce with the human kind; and that from that commerce the greatest heroes sprang. Why may not a similar opinion have prevailed among the Hebrews? That it was common at the commencement of Christianity is clear from Josephus and Philo; and from the earliest Christian writers both Greek and Latin; who read in their copies, or translations, of the Septuagint, *αγγελοι*, *angeli*, instead of *υιοι*; and so read still the Alexandrian, and three other mss.*; and so read the Coptic; and even the Perfic version, although not made from the Septuagint.

But it is absurd to imagine that the angels had commerce with women. True: but how many absurdities were believed, and are yet believed, by many Jews and many Christians? The question is not, whether it were an absurd, but whether it were a common belief? And of this, I presume, there is no doubt. The writer of Genesis, then, might believe, that the *angels*, called *the sons, of God*, were the fathers of those giants, or heroes, who corrupted the world by their violences and atrocities; which were ultimately the cause of the deluge.

Let us next see what meaning those who object to the absurdity of the former opinion, would give to the words; and what hypothesis they would substitute in the room of the more

* See Dr. Holmes's various readings on Genesis, just now published.

ing of the present text, in both Heb. and Sam. copies; without any material variety of lection*. It was undoubtedly the reading of Symmachus's copy: for he renders it by *αποει*; and of that of Jerom, who in his Hebr. Quest. expressly says: "In Hebræo scriptum est: *non judicabit spiritus meus*," &c.—Were I to adopt the Greek rendering of the Septuagint, I would say that they took *רוח*, or *רוח*, for the future of *רוח*; which, from the noun *רוח*, we may suppose to have signified *to enbeathe*: as if God had said: "My spirit shall not for ever be ensheathed in man:" that is, The vital breath, with which I inspired him, shall not for ever, or rather for a long time, animate its sheath of clay: 120 years only shall be allowed him.—This would appear to be the meaning of the Greek translators: and this acceptation of the word *רוח* was adopted by our first modern translator Pagninus, who renders "*non erit in vagina*." He borrowed the idea from R. I. Kimhi: but few, I believe, beside Cajetan and Mariana, have, in this, followed him. The generality of interpreters have, with Munster and Luther, given to *רוח* the meaning of *rixari, contendere, disceptare*: and so our vulgar version: "My spirit shall not always strive with man." So, also, Michaëlis: "Mein geist soll die menschen nicht immerfort strafen."—Singular, I think, is the version of Rosenmüller †: "*Non contemnetur spiritus meus inter homines*." This translation he grounds on an Arabic signification of *רוח*, which denotes *inferiority, vileness, contempt*. "Ita ut significatione *vilis, contemptus fuit* in verbum Hebraicum translata, totius commatis sensus hic fit: *Non feram, ut spiritus meus, per prophetas admonens homines, ab his in perpetuum contemnatur: puriam: mortales fiant: omnes post centum et viginti annos interibunt*."

Having thus fairly given the translations of others, I now venture to support my own.—The whole difficulty lies in the two words *רוח* and *בשם*. Let me endeavour to fix their meaning.

The verb *רוח*, before a person without a præfix, generally means *to do justice* to that person; and, in the coactive voice, *to avenge* that person, or *cause him to be righted*. Thus Gen. 30. 6. "God hath *righted me*," *רָחַמַנִי*. And Deut. 32. 36. "The Lord *will avenge* his people" *רוח יְהוָה עַם*. See also Gen. 49. 16. Ps. 50. 4.—54. 3.—72. 2.—But when *רוח* is followed by a person, or persons, with the præfix *ב*, then it signifies *to execute justice on*, i. e. *to punish*. So Ps. 110. 6. "He will execute justice on the nations" *רוח בְּגוֹיִם*: and so here *רוח בְּאָדָם* must be rendered, *to execute justice on mankind; to punish mankind*. These are the only meanings of the verb *רוח*; nor can a single example be brought to shew that, either in its active or coactive voice, it ever signifies *rixari, contendere, disceptare; to strive*. It is true, that *רוח* sometimes, and *רוח* frequently signify *contentions* ‡; but *רוח* never to *contend*.—I have, therefore, no hesitation in rendering the first part of the passage literally: My spirit "shall not execute, or pronounce, judgment against man:" and as *רוח* is allowed by the best critics to be the same with *אני* or *אניכי*, I have put in my version "I will not . . . pronounce judgment," &c.—The word *בשם* is next to be considered. It has been commonly supposed to be a compound of the præfix *ב*, the pronoun *ש* for *אשר*, and the indeclinable particle *נ*; and rendered *eo quod etiam, propterea*

* One ms. has *רוח*, and one *רוח*. This latter is evidently an error of the transcriber.

† Unless, perhaps, the Erpenian Arab have some such meaning.

‡ For a plain reason, because they are often brought before the judge: as is implied by the præfix *mem*.

quod, because; or, as our English translators render, *for that also*.—I cannot acquiesce in this derivation, because I find nowhere else such a compound in the whole Pentateuch; nor indeed in any historical book of the Old Testament. I find שָׁנָה in the book of Ecclesiastes for אֲשֶׁר נָס; but no where בִּשְׁנָה * for בְּאֲשֶׁר נָס. Nay, I do not believe that the earliest Hebrew writers ever used ש for אֲשֶׁר; in prose at least: and the first instance in poetry, which I at present recollect, is in the song of Debora, Jud. 5. 7.

It was this consideration, probably, that led Guffet, Michaëlis and Dathe to make שָׁנָה the infinitive of שָׁנָה *errare*; and render *propter errores eorum*; Michaël. *wen sie irren*.

I, likewise, take שָׁנָה or שָׁנָה to be the root of the word: but I give it a somewhat different meaning; a meaning which I think inherent in the verb; and which sets the mercy and long suffering of God in a fairer point of view: "I will never at unawares † pronounce (or execute) judgment on mankind." They shall not be punished unwarned—בִּשְׁנָה in *ignorantia eorum*. They are but frail flesh; and shall have yet 120 years given them to repent and amend their lives. Such, I think, is the meaning of the Text; which I thus point: לֹא יִדָּן לִבְשָׂר רַחֲמֵי בָאֲדָם לְעוֹלָם בִּשְׁנָה דָּוָה בְּשָׂר—Let others judge for themselves.

Ver. 4. *In those days were giants*, or rather *the giants* גִּבּוֹרִים. The word is variously rendered by the antient translators. Sep. and Gr. Ven. γίγαντες, Vulg. gigantes. But Aquila has ΓΙΓΑΝΤΟΤΕΣ, Sym. ὁ βίανος, Syr. גִּבּוֹרָא, Onk. גִּבּוֹרָא, Arab. نَبَاوَرَة, Pers. رَئِزَان; all which denote *great, powerful, violent men*.—The Hebrew word may be derived either from נָפַל or פָּלָה. The former has generally been considered as the root; and גִּבּוֹרִים made to signify *the fallers-on*: equivalent to the ΓΙΓΑΝΤΟΤΕΣ of Aquila; as if they *fell upon* the weak and unwary, and killed or spoiled them ‡. Dathe translates it *latrones*; which is approved by Rosenmüller: "Non enim necesse est (says he) genus quoddam singulare hominum, altiori quam solita statura, intelligere, uti multi antiquorum interpretum fecerunt. Quum enim נָפַל *incidere, irruere* denotet, גִּבּוֹרִים erunt *irruentes*; i. e. *prædones, latrones*, qui fortasse equis latrocinia exercebant; ut Arabum hodie multi: ex quo genere etiam centauri Græcorum fuerunt."—This is certainly ingenious: yet, I think the other etymon preferable; according to which גִּבּוֹרִים will signify *the distinguished*, men who *separated* themselves from the multitude, and established themselves into a higher, domineering cast: hence they are, just after, called אֲנָשֵׁי דָשָׁם *men of name*, "the famed heroes of antiquity."

Ver. 13. *The abomination of all flesh*, &c. קָץ כָּל בָּשָׂר. I derive קָץ from קָץ, not from קָצָה; because I think, that "The end of all flesh is come before me" is not an Hebraism. Something similar, indeed, occurs Jerem. 51. 13. בֹּא קָצָה *Thine end is come, or coming*; and in some other places the same mode of expression is found: but this, in my apprehension, is different from the present construction of בָּא. Here בָּא seems equivalent to אָלֵי Gen. 18. 21. "According to the report that *batb come to me*;" and Exod. 3. 9. "The cry of the children of Israel *batb reached me*;" בָּאָה אֵלַי. So Jonah 2. 7. תְּבוּאָה אֵלַי תְּפִלָּתִי "My prayer *came to thee*."—In short, בָּא followed by לִפְנֵי, לִפְנֵי, &c. to me appears to signify, not the

* The composition most analogous to it is בִּשְׁנָה in Ecclef. 2. 16.

† Our English translators have used the same term, Num. 35. 11, 15. and Josh. 20. 9.

‡ So Jerom in Q. Hebr. *Cadentes erant in terra*.

arrival of any period; but *the coming* of something into one's *presence*.—This, however, I give only as a probable opinion; and not without some little doubt and hesitation.

Ver. 14. *An ark*. I have noticed in my explanatory note, that *ship* perhaps would be a better rendering. The Hebr. word is תִּבְתָּ (six mss. have תִּבְתָּ) *shebat* or *thibath*, the constructive form of תִּבָּה which is evidently the Greek ἑλκή; and so the Septuagint render the word Exod. 2. 3. where only it again occurs. Here they render it κιβωτός*, Josephus λαβυρινθος, Vulg. *arcam*, Syr. קַבְוֹתָא, Onk. and Tharg. תִּבְתָּא, Arab. Poll. تَابُوتًا, Arab. Erp. تَابُوتًا†, Perf. כִּבְשִׁי, *chefti*, i. e. *a ship*. And so the Sam. version סִפִּינָה.

That the *ark* of Noah answered, in some sense, the purpose of a *ship* is clear: but it is not so certain that it was of the same form and shape. The argument used by Michaëlis, Dathe and Rosenmüller is, in my opinion, not conclusive. "The word תִּבְתָּ, say they, is badly rendered by the word *ark*: for the form of an *ark* is altogether unfit for the purpose to which the vessel of Noah was destined. It must have had the roundish form of a *ship*; otherwise it could not have resisted the force of the waves."—But whence is deduced the necessity of its resisting the force of the waves? It was not intended to be conducted like a ship from any determined place to another; but merely "to float on the surface of the waters." See ch. 7. 17. It appears to have had neither helm, nor mast, nor oars: but was a bulky capacious vessel, light enough to be raised aloft, with all its contents, by the gradual rise of the deluge. It was therefore of little importance of what shape it was: and it might be as well of the form of an *ark* as of any other. The *ark*, in which Moses was exposed, was a vessel of the same nature, and bears the same name; and some have thought that both were made of the same materials; as we shall see in the next Remark. With respect to the etymology of the Hebrew word, the most rational seems to be that of Clodius, who derives it from the Arab. رَاكِبٌ *collegit*; "ex quo," says he, תִּבְתָּ, or תִּבְתָּ, locum significat in quem res colligantur."—Forster derives it from two Egyptian words, *thoi* a *ship*, and *bai* a *palm-tree branch*. Such ships are still to be seen not only in Egypt, but in India and other countries; particularly in some isles in the Pacific Ocean. See Forster *De bysso antiquorum*.

1b. *Gopher-wood*. עֵץ גִּפְרִי. We are here again puzzled by the variety of interpretation. What is *Gopher-wood*?—The Septuagint have ξύλα τετραγώνη‡ *square boards*; Vulg. *lignis levigatis*, smoothed boards. Onk. קִדְרֹס § *cedar*. Syr. עֲרֵקָא, which, in the Polyglott, is rendered *vimen*; but which Castellus takes for the *juniper*; which in Syria grows to such a size, as that boards twenty feet long may be made of it. Both Arabs have شَجَرٌ rendered by some *box-wood*, by others the *juniper*, and by others the *cypress*. Perf. עֵתֶר the *pine*. All, apparently, so many pure conjectures; and none of which have any literal similarity to the Hebrew term, except the *cypress*, κυπαρισσός; of which the five first letters have a resemblance to גִּפְרִי. Hence

* So also Gr. Ven.

† All these are equivalent to κιβωτός, or κιβή. The Coptic translator retained the Greek word with the Coptic article.

‡ In the Rom. edition, and in Holmer's Collations, are three other readings; which Montfaucon supposes to be those of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion: namely, τετραγώνη, τετραγώνη and τετραγώνη; but the second of these is found in six mss. of Sep. and was read by Chrysostom.

§ So also the Thargums, and the Gr. of Venice.

most modern interpreters, with Celsius, will have it to be the *cypress*; because that tree abounds in Syria, Phœnicia, and Assyria: and a great quantity of *Gopher*-wood must have been needed for so large a vessel as *Nosh's* ark. On the other side, Michaëlis, for that very reason, objects to the *cypress*. "Si enim ejusmodi arbor Hebræis, Aramæis, Arabibus domestica fuisset, nomen ejus sapius in Cod. Hebræo, et in aliis libris orientalibus occurrere deberet. Sed quum neutrum horum sit, colligi potest, hanc arborem in regionibus supra memoratis plane non crescere." I cannot deem this a strong objection: for, under what other name does this tree, so abundant in the country, appear to be more frequently mentioned in the Hebrew scripture? Or, rather, what is the real Hebrew name for the *cypress-tree*? The most antient Greek translators make it sometimes the *צמר*, sometimes the *ברוש*, and sometimes the *ברת*. So uncertain were they about its real Hebrew denomination. Our last English translators found it but once, I think, in the whole Hebrew Bible, and that in the word *ררר*, *Is. 44. 14* which, in Lowth's translation, is the *pine*. In truth, the particular species of trees, herbs, stones, metals and animals, mentioned in the Hebrew writings, are now little known: and nothing but a long residence in the oriental regions, a thorough acquaintance with the various vulgar dialects, and a deep philosophical research into the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms, can ever throw more light, than we have, on this subject.

Bochart wasted his great learning to shew, that *גפר* is the *ebony-tree*: but this, certainly, of all woods, is the most unfit for the purpose.

Michaëlis would derive the word from the Arabic *גפר* *adolevit*; and render *full grown trees*, "grosse vollkommen aufgewachsene bäume."

Delgado, a learned London Jew, who has given some good observations on the Pentateuch, translates *pitched planks*; with this remark: "*Gopher*-wood is wrong: for *עצי* is in the plural number, and means rather *planks* or *boards*; and *גפר* is derived from *נפרית*, which is a sort of bitumen, or pitch; and I take it to be the same as *נפר*: for the *כ* and *נ* are often put in Hebrew indifferently; as we find *יכרר* and *יכרר* to have the same meaning." The remark is ingenious; but it is not new: for St. Jerom thought the Hebrew word had that signification. "*Pro quadratis lignis (says he) bituminata legimus in Hebræo.*" *Quest. Hebr. in Gen.* Did he read *נפר*, or did he, with Delgado, take it and *גפר* to be the same?—However that be, I cannot allow that *עצי גפר* can mean *pitched planks*; for two reasons. 1. Because, in that case, there would be a tautology in the text: for what need to tell us afterward that the ark was *pitched*, if it were told to us before that it was made of *pitched planks*? 2dly, Supposing that *גפר* means *pitch* or *bitumen*, *עצי גפר* could not signify *pitched planks*; but either *trees producing pitch*, or *planks made of such trees*. The word *עצי* being in the plural number is no sufficient cause for not rendering it *wood*: for so it is elsewhere rendered, even in the Pentateuch, without being objected to by Delgado. So *Setim-wood* *עצי שטים*, *Exod. 25. 10.* and often in the same and following chapters.

These are the various interpretations which I have met with, or at present recollect, of the word *גפר*, or rather *נפר*, for so I think it was originally written. Others may have conjectured otherwise: so, since we must be contented with conjectures, let me conjecture also.—My conjecture then is, That the Syriac translator has given the true meaning in the word *ערק*; and that this word has been well rendered by the Latin word *vimen*. Let us try to fix

the meaning of both.—The latter signifies in general a *twig, rod, wicker* of any kind; and is equivalent to the Greek *λῦγος, ῥαβδός, σισυα*. Now that the Syr. word *אָרְכָא* has the same meaning, appears to me most probable from its certainly signifying a *sie, ligament, belt, &c.* which I doubt not were all originally made of slender *twigs* or *wishes*. In Arabic the same word signifies a chest, coffer or basket made of twigs, particularly of palm-tree leaves. And, indeed, all the first vessels of capacity, whether coffer, ark, or ship, seem to have been composed of the same materials. The ship or ark of Noah, then, if ever such an ark existed, was, in my apprehension, a large coffer formed of twigs, like basket-work, and covered over with bitumen, both within and without, to keep out the water. Whether those twigs were of osier, or palm-tree, or hazel, or poplar, or birch, or juniper*, or any other kind of vimineous wood, I would not rashly say: but I think it must have been the osier; which, as we learn from Columella, was considered as the principal of the wicker kind. “*Vimina fiunt ex populorum virgis, ulmi, et sanguineorum fruticum; et betulæ, et coryli intortæ, et salicis, quæ principatum obtinent.*” Certain we are that boats, barks and ships were originally made of such twigs, and particularly of *osier*. Those even, which were externally covered with skins, had their ribs at least of that wood; no doubt, on account of its pliability. See Herodotus, Clio; and Niebuhr *Voyage de l’Arabie*, vol. ii. p. 175.

It has been already remarked, that the Syriac version has a word denoting wicker-wood, *אָרְכָא*, *arka*, or *orka*†. The Sam. ver. has a word, which has probably the same meaning, *סִיסָא*; which in an Arabic version, made from the Sam. is rendered *סִיסָא*‡. I know that this word is thought to be by some the *pine*, by others the *juniper*, by others the *box-tree*, and by Bochart the *ebony*: but I am persuaded that it is either the willow, or some species of wood of the wattling kind, fit for making wicker-works, such as hedges, coffers, baskets, arks, &c. We find several analogous terms in the Chaldee and Arabic. In the former *סִיסָא* and *סִיסָא* signify a *bedge*; in the latter *סִיסָא* is a large *corn* or *bread-basket*; *סִיסָא* is a *bedge*, and *סִיסָא* any *reed, twig, or rod*, fit for making a hedge.

It is further remarkable, that the word *karbb* (which is only the Hebrew *כַּרְבִּי*, with a common transposition of letters) signifies in the Erse, or Scoto-Celtic dialect, both a *ship* and a *basket*; and that among the various names of a *ship*, among the Scytho-Scandinavians, the first mentioned by Verelius is *karphi*. See Vallancey’s *Collectanea*, No. 14. *Introd.* p. 33.—Add that *כַּרְבִּי* in Arabic signifies a *basket* or *coffer*: and I have no doubt, that this last word, as well as the Greek *καρβος*, is derived from the same origin.

I could support this signification of the word *כַּרְבִּי* by many other probable collateral arguments: but I fear I have already more than sufficiently *Bochartized*: so I return to my text.

Ib. *Full of cells thou shalt make the ark.* קִנִּים תַּעֲשֶׂה אֶת הָאָרְכָּה. Lit. “Nests thou shalt make the ark:” that is, thou shalt divide it into a number of proper receptacles for the animals, and other things to be contained in it.—The ingenious Abraham Dawson, however, gives

* Which is often used in wattling, even in this island.

† May not this be the very *arca* of the Latins, and our *ark*? a more probable etymon, surely, than that which derives it from *אָרְכָא*.

‡ By the Thalmudists called *סִיסָא*.—The original word itself is still in use in the Scoto-Saxon dialect, *saugh*, (pron. *sax*) and is the general name for the *willow*.

another turn to the passage, and renders thus: "Make thee an ark of bulrushes: of reeds קנים thou shalt make the ark." He supposes that the original reading was not קנין, but קנים, as in Exod. 2. 3., and he makes קנים the plural of קנה a *reed*, and not of קן a *nest*.—I see no good reason, either for changing the reading of the Text, or the etymon of קנים; which signify not only *nests*, but any small *mansions, cells, lodgements, conclaves, &c.*: just such as the various apartments in the ark of Noah must have been.

Ib. *With bitumen thou shalt pitch it over.* כפרת אתה בכפר Lit. "Thou shalt coat it with a coating:" but as that *coating* or *covering* was most probably *bitumen*; I have followed the Sep. and Vulg.: who render, the former ασφαλτωσιν αυτην τη ασφαλτη*; the latter, *bitumine linies*.—Most of the other antient versions either retain the Hebrew word, as Syr. Onk. and Arab. Pol. or use a term that may denote *bitumen* as well as any other pitchy substance. Thus Arab. Erp. باملوس, Sam. Ver. בקלפן †, Pers. دیرکل; if کل be not a typographical error, for קל.—The Thargums only, more explicitly, call it *bitumen*, בוחרן; as the Gr. of Ven. is more explicit for *pitch*, πωτισσις τ' αυτην εν πωτη.—This last term has been preferred by our English, and most other modern, translators; although their *antesignanus* Sanctes Pagninus led them a different road: for he has *bituminabis eam bitumine*: which Arias Montanus retained; and which Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, and Rosenmüller have equipollently adopted.—*Bitumine illinies*—*bitumine obducito*—*bitumine obduc* ‡.

The *bitumen Judaicum*, or *asphaltus*, was the most proper of all substances for pitching over the ark of Noah. At first, soft, viscous, and pliable, it might be thrust into every chasm and crevice with the greatest ease: but it would soon acquire a tenacity and hardness superiour to those of our pitch. A coat of it, spread over both the inside § and the outside of an ark of wicker-work, would make it perfectly water-proof and impenetrable: and the longer it was kept in the water, the harder and stronger it would grow. The Arabs still use it for careening their vessels: and, mixt with a tenth part of common pitch, it has been employed to the same purpose in our days, by Mr. De la Sabloniere, at L'Orient. This mixture is called *pissasphaltus*.

Ver. 15. *Three hundred cubits, &c.* The dimensions of the ark of Noah || have been objected to as wholly inadequate: and indeed if so many pairs of all the beasts and birds now known entered into it with provisions for a whole year, we must allow that the objection is well founded. It was made by Apelles, one of Marcion's disciples, and by Celsus: and was answered by Origen in a very singular manner. He learned, it seems, from some Hebrew rabbins, that the dimensions of Moses are to be considered according to a certain geometrical power, by which the real extent of the ark becomes ninety thousand cubits long, and two

* So likewise Aquila, αλοφουσις αλοιφη.

† This seems, like the Hebrew word, to be a generic term: from which is, most probably, derived the Spanish *calfatear* and the French *calfeutrer*. See the next note.

‡ In the new revisal of the French Geneva version, which was made, I think, about the middle of this century, we have a similar rendering: "Tu la calfeutreras de bitume."—And La Cene: "Vous le goudronnerez de bitume."

§ This circumstance, too, seems strongly to make for a vessel of wicker work. If it had been constructed of planks, like our ships, there would have been no need for an inner coating.

|| The ark of Xisuthrus, the Noah of Berosus, was much larger: its length was five furlongs; and two furlongs its breadth.—The Hebrew historian most probably proportioned his ark according to his own scanty knowledge of natural history, and the number of beasts and birds with which he was acquainted.

thousand and five hundred cubits broad! τὴ δυνάμει λεγέσθαι τὰ μέτρα· ὡς εἶναι μὲν εἶναι μακάριον τὸ μέτρον κατὰ τὴν βούλην, κατὰ δὲ τὸ τέλος διόχλησιν πάντοτε καὶ ὅλων.*—If Apelles and Celsus were satisfied with such an answer, they were not hard to please. Our modern commentators flick to the simple dimensions as they are; and labour to demonstrate that there was room enough. The reader, if he choose, may see the sum of what they have said in Calmet's Dictionary.—For my part, I freely confess, that their pretended demonstrations tend only to make me more sceptical—but I leave the subject to mathematical divines, and proceed in my critical career.

Ver. 16. *A sloping deck.* רָצָה. This word has been generally rendered a *window*, or *light*; very improperly in my opinion; although countenanced by the Vulgate, and most other ancient versions. The Hebrew word for a window is חֲלוֹן, not רָצָה; nor has this latter the signification of *window* in any kindred dialect. In Arabic it denotes a *ridge*, *culmen*; and here it, apparently, means a gradual culmination of the deck of the ark. The Septuagint seem to have well understood the meaning; although they have not perfectly expressed it. Their version, in the present copies, is ἐκπυκνωσάντων προσωπεῖς τὴν κλισίαν, *colligens facies arcam*: but one of Holmes's mss. has, in the margin, ἐκπυκνωσάντων; which, I am much inclined to believe, is the true reading. At least it is more grammatical than the other, and better expresses what I take to be the real meaning of the author. The ark was gradually contracted at the top, in the form of a sloping roof; and the middle of that roof rose a whole cubit higher than its extremities: and this slope, as I have remarked in my explanatory note, was sufficient, when covered with bitumen, to let the water pass easily off the deck. See Buteo's Dissertation on the Ark, at the end of the second vol. of the Sacred Critics, Rosenmüller's Scholia, and Dathe's note on the place.

Ver. 17. *A deluge of waters.* Lit. *the deluge of waters*. But the Hebrew definite article is often to be expressed in English by the indefinite. Instead of *waters* מַיִם *Michaëlis* would read מֵי הַיָּם *from the sea*. For it is not probable, says he, that even a forty days rain would have produced such a deluge, unless the water had at the same time issued from the ocean. Certainly it is not probable: nor does the historian say so. He tells us that "the fountains of the great deep were broken up," chap. 7. ver. 11. and the waters that came from those fountains were as truly waters, as those that fell from the heavens. I see no necessity, then, to change the present punctuation: although Schulze has adopted Michaëlis's correction. Dathe has well rendered the Hebrew, "Etenim ego aquarum inundationem terræ immittam."

C H A P. VII.

Ver. 3. THE two additions which I have here inserted, on the authority of Sam. Sep. and Syr. are considered by Michaëlis, Rosenmüller, and others, as interpolations. I, on the contrary, consider them as essential parts of the original Text; which is evidently lame and mutilated without them; as it is, indeed, in many many other places. One cannot help smiling at Rosenmüller's way of reasoning: "Non opus est hoc additamento, quum jam per se ipsum intelligatur necesse fuisse ut utriusque generis aves et mundæ et immundæ fervarentur."—By the same mode of arguing, the last colon of ver. 2. is equally superfluous: and I doubt not,

* Contr. Cels. l. 4. No. 41. See also Hom. 2. in Genesim, vol. 2. p. 62.

but that if it were wanting in the Hebrew, although found in the Samaritan Text, it would also be, by those gentlemen, denominated an useless interpolation. But I appeal to the common sense of every unbiassed plain reader, and ask him, if he expect not the same manner of narrating in the 3d verse, as he finds in the second? or if he see any thing superfluous in the 3d verse, as it stands in my translation?

Ver. 11. *The fountains of the great deep, &c.* By this mean, the whole face of the earth was, according to our historian, reduced to the same state as it was before the six days creation. See what has been said on chap. 2. ver. 6.

Ib. *The flood-gates of the heavens.* Although this may only imply a great and copious rain; may not *typhons*, or water-spouts, be more particularly designed? They are not unusual on the coasts of Syria; and are more frequent at the equinoxes, and in a tempestuous sky.

Ver. 20. *Fifteen cubits higher, &c.* This has been always accounted one of the most unaccountable phenomena of the deluge; and has, more than any other circumstance attending it, perplexed and puzzled commentators. The most ingenious solution of the difficulty which I have met with, is one sent to me, some years ago, by Sir Henry Englefield; which I shall here give in his own words: "The diameter of the earth being taken at 8000 miles; and the highest mountain being supposed four miles high above the level of the sea*, the quantity of water requisite to cover them will be an hollow sphere of 8008 miles diameter, and four miles thick; the content of which, in round numbers, is 800,000,000 cubic miles.—Let us now suppose the globe of the earth to consist of a crust of solid matter, 1000 miles thick, enclosing a sea or body of water 2000 miles deep; within which is a central nucleus of 2000 miles in diameter: the content of that body of water will be 109,200,000,000 cubic miles; or about 137 times the quantity of water required to cover the surface of the earth as above stated. Now water, by experiment, expands about one 25th of its whole magnitude, from freezing to boiling; or one hundredth of its magnitude for 45 degrees of Fahrenheit's thermometer. Suppose, then, that the heat of the globe, previously to the deluge, was about 50 degrees of Fahrenheit's, a temperature very near that of this climate; and that a sudden change took place in the interior of the globe, which raised its heat to 83 degrees; an heat no greater than the marine animals live in, in the shallow seas between the tropics; those 23 degrees of augmented heat would so expand the internal sea, as to cause it to more than cover the surface of the globe, according to the conditions abovementioned: and if the cause of heat ceased, the waters would of course, in cooling, retire into their former places.—If the central nucleus be supposed 3000 miles, and the internal sea only 1500 miles deep, its content will then be 99,200,000,000 cubic miles, or 125 times the water required: and, in that case, an additional heat of 36 degrees to the previous temperature of the earth will be sufficient to produce the above described effect.—It is scarce necessary to say, that the perfect regularity here supposed to exist in the form of the interior parts of the globe, is of no consequence to the proposed hypothesis; which will be equally just, if the above given quantity of waters be any how disposed within the earth.—Neither is it here proposed to discuss the reality of a central fire, which many philosophers maintain, and many deny.—It may not

* This is more than the height of the Andes.

“ be unworthy to remark, that the above hypothesis, which does not in any way contradict any law of nature, does singularly accord with the Mosaic narrative of the deluge: for the sudden expansion of the internal waters would, of course, force them up through the chasms of the exterior crust in dreadful jets and torrents; while their heat would cause such vapours to ascend into the atmosphere, as, when condensed, would produce torrents of rain beyond our conception.”

The possibility of a universal deluge, then; of a deluge rising *fifteen cubits above the highest mountains**, can hardly be denied: but whether such a deluge ever happened is another question. Certain it is, that the belief of a general deluge prevailed among most antient nations: but local and partial exundations may have given rise to this belief. The daughters of Lot imagined that all mankind were enveloped in the destruction of Sodom. A traditional tale is easily exaggerated and improved upon, by credulous posterity; and the first *writer* gives it with all the accumulated circumstances. What reason have we to think, that the Hebrew historian was exempt from the common lot? All we can say is, that he has better told his tale: and this, I presume, will not be denied by the greatest sceptic; who has compared it with the similar stories of the Chaldee, Phœnician, Egyptian, Indian, and Greek mythologists.—After all he will be apt to say, with honest Abraham Dawson, that “ the whole history of the deluge, considered as a literal, historical narration of facts, is encumbered with great and numerous difficulties: nor doth it seem possible to account for it without *miracle upon miracle*.”—To this I freely subscribe; and think that the inference to be drawn is: That a good deal of the fabulous is mixt with the history of Noah’s flood.—The reader, however, may, if he please, consult Le Clerc, Calmet, Jerusalem, Michaëlis, Dathe—who have all treated on the subject with acuteness and ingenuity.—See also the 1st vol. of Universal History.

C H A P. VIII.

Ver. 4. *THE seventeenth day*.—Sep. and Vulg. have *twenty-seventh day*: which Houbigant badly defends. It is, indeed, incompatible with the 11th and 24th verses of last chapter; as Masius most justly remarks.

Ver. 7. *Did not return*. The present Text has *וַיֵּצֵא וַיָּשָׁב*; which is commonly rendered *exibat, exiens et rediens*; or, as our common English, “ went forth, to and fro.”—With Capellus and Houbigant, I prefer the reading of Sep. Syr. and Vulg. who are supposed by Bochart to have read in their Hebrew copies *וַיֵּצֵא וַיָּשָׁב*; that is, *וַיָּשָׁב* instead of *וַיֵּצֵא*, *scriptiōne satis simili*, says Houbigant. In this I cannot agree with him: there is very little similarity between *וַיֵּצֵא* and *וַיָּשָׁב*, either in the Heb. or Sam. characters. I rather think that the Greek translators read all that is in the present Text, although they did not literally render it; and that they read *וַיָּשָׁב* or *וַיֵּצֵא* besides, after *וַיֵּצֵא*. The Syriac translator must have read both *וַיֵּצֵא* and *וַיָּשָׁב* in his

* It is not at all necessary to suppose, with Sir Henry, that the antediluvian mountains were as high as those of the present earth. They may have been of a very different form and size, and composed of other materials.

† Sam. and 24 mss. have *וַיָּשָׁב* instead of *וַיֵּצֵא*; and 5 mss. with Sam. have *וַיֵּצֵא וַיָּשָׁב* instead of *וַיֵּצֵא*. This is of little moment.

Hebrew copy, as he renders them both, *עָזַב עֲזִיזָא* *exit exiens*: but he must also have read *וְלֹא* after those words, as he adds *וְלֹא נָחַץ*, *et non reversus est*. The meaning is well given by his Latin translator in the Polyglott, “*qui quidem egressus est, neque reversus*”—“*He went out indeed, נָחַץ נָחַץ* (a common Hebraism) but he did not return*.”—And his *not returning* made Noah send out a dove after him; who was a more faithful messenger than the carnivorous raven; because she found nothing to tempt her to be faithless; as she fed, not on carrion, but on grain and vegetables; which were not yet to be had.

Ver. 11. *A newly-plucked olive-leaf*. Sam. and 1 ms. have *לֵךְ* *leaves*; and Houbigant prefers this reading: “*Quippe non dubium est hic significari furculum oleæ virentem, pluribus foliis instructum.*” This opinion is strengthened by Syr. Onk. and the Vulgate; which have all a word denoting a *branch*, rather than a leaf. Josephus too has *θαλλόν*: Sep. has *φυλλων*: but two of Holmes’s mss. have *φύλλων*, which perhaps is the true reading; at least betters the construction: *φυλλων ελασις καρπος*; *a branch of olive-leaves*.—The olive-tree keeps its verdure even under water; as we learn from Pliny † and Theophrastus ‡.

Ver. 19. The arrangement of the Hebrew here is both irregular and incomplete. It is, however, an old error; as Onkelos and Jonathan must have found it in their copies; not to mention the more modern Persic translator, the Erpen. Arab. and the Gr. of Venice.—I am fully persuaded that the original order is preserved in the Sam. copies: out of which, however, I suspect a word or two have been dropped; which the Sep. and Syr. supply. The words dropped seem to be *וְכָל הַבְּהֵמָה* Sep. *παντα τα κτηνη* ||; Syr. *כלה בעירא*. Vulg. *jumenta*.—From these three versions and Sam. copy § I have composed my Version. See Various Readings.

Ver. 20. *To the Lord*. So Heb. Sam. Syr. Chald. Vulg. Gr. Ven. and all the printed editions of Sep. except Alex. But not less than 21 Gr. mss. ** with Copt. and both Arabs, have “*To God*.”—I notice this as a matter of little importance in itself: but merely to shew that the words *יהוה* and *אלוהים* have often been interchanged by copyists, and the one substituted for the other, either by mistake or by caprice.—I shall rarely henceforth remark on such transmutations.

Ver. 22. It is clear that, in this verse, the author meant to denote the various seasons of the circling year; but as he uses six †† different terms, they cannot exactly correspond to our four seasons. The first two admit of no difficulty: *זֶרַע* is *seed-time*, *קציר* is *harvest*: the former of which began in Judæa about the autumnal, the latter about the vernal equinox. It is not so clear what is meant by *קָר* and *חום*, which I have, with most other translators, rendered *cold* and *heat*. The word *קָר*, however, means rather a *refreshing coolness*, than intense cold; and *חום* rather a *gentle warmth*, than intense heat. May not, then, the refreshing breezes of *spring*

* Josephus says, he did return: *ωρας Νυκτων επιστηλθε*: and Jerom Quest. Hebr. says his copies read *egressus est, exiens et reversus*: so their testimony, as far as it goes, is in favour of the present Text.

† Hist. Nat. b. 13. chap. 25.

‡ Hist. Plant. b. 4. chap. 8.

|| They are wanting in some copies, and in the Coptic and Armenian versions, made from Sep.

§ With which the Arab. of Saadias perfectly agrees.

** Add 3 Arab. mss. 2 Armen. and the printed Armenian. One of Holmes’s mss. has both readings *Κυριω τω Θεω*.

†† The Indians count six seasons: 1. *Sesfar*, the dewy season. 2. *Haemar*, the cold season. 3. *Vasart*, the mild season. 4. *Grasbma*, the hot season. 5. *Varfa*, the rainy season. 6. *Sarat*, the breaking up of the rain.

be designed by קר, and the diminished heat of autumn by חור ? We then shall have the four seasons in opposition: *spring and autumn, summer and winter*. Or if the author meant to arrange them in succession, קר may still be the vernal coolness of February, חור the genial warmth of May, קי the scorching heat of August, and חורף the nipping cold of November. The Alexandrian Greek translators render the whole thus: *καρπυσιαι και θερισμος, ψυχρος και καυμος, θερος και εαρ*. This last word they are supposed to have employed, rather than *καυμα*, to accommodate their version to the climate of Egypt.—It is remarkable that the Greek of Venice renders קי not by *θερος*, but by *καρπυσιαι*, the autumn, or fruit-season.—The reader who wishes to have a proper idea of the seasons in Palestine, to which no doubt the author alluded, will do well to consult Harmer's *Observations on divers Passages of Scripture*; and Dr. Ruffel's excellent work, *The Natural History of Aleppo*; to which I shall have often occasion to refer, in the sequel of these Remarks.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 2. *TO you I subject them all*. Lit. Into your hands I give them בידכֶם נתתי. I follow the reading of Sam. and partly of Sep. *δεδωκα*, or *εδωκα*—which, from the Copt. and Slavon. versions, I suspect to have been originally *δεδωκα αυτα*; corresponding exactly with Sam.—All the other versions, with the present Heb. have, *are subjected to you*, בידכֶם נתנו.—Houbigant is not pleased with either of these readings: and would supply *ecce illa*, before בידכֶם. But surely there is no need of this supplement. The Sam. reading is quite grammatical and full; the affix *vau* answering to the preceding כל in the singular; although it must be expressed plurally in English. I have added *all* in my version, not because I think it necessary to the integrity of the Text; but because it is virtually contained in it. I might add, that perhaps it originally stood there, as it does in the end of next verse. Chrysostom read it in his copy of Sep. *παντα*, and that is still the reading of one of Holmes's mss.

Ver. 5. *From a man's own brother*. כִּד אִישׁ חוּד. The Sam. copy and 8 mss. have a *vau* before חוּד; and so Syr. and Vulg. which Houbigant prefers. Without reason; for חוּד is only *a brother*. The comma is admirably well rendered by the Greek of Venice *προς χερας αδελφου αυτου*.

Ver. 6. *Whoever, among men, &c.* וְהָאִישׁ בָּאָדָם, that is, *the man, among men, who, &c.* The Vulgate, including both words in one, *quisque*, has well and fully expressed the meaning. The common Greek Text is corrupted and unintelligible; nor do the mss. afford any thing like a decent correction. Dr. Holmes suspects, that the original reading was *αυμα το εαυτου*; which, from the resemblance in old uncial mss. between *epsilon* and *sigma*, might readily be altered into *αυματος αυτου*. This is an ingenious conjecture; but it does not completely heal the sore. The construction is better with the addition in Epiphanius, Cedrenus, and the Armenian edited version. Yet, still I am convinced, the Hebrew has another meaning. The Syr. and Arab. versions retain the Hebraism. Houbigant adopts the Sam. reading אִישׁ בָּאָדָם without the prefix ה, and renders “*erit homo pro homine*,” a forced construction, and contrary to the analogy of Hebrew grammar.—Our common English version: “*By man shall his blood be shed*,” seems to have been formed from Onkelos, who supposes that by this is meant the

the sentence of the magistrate. To the same purport Castalio, Junius, Luther, the Dutch, &c. Diodati and the Genevans seem to have considered it as a mere pleonasm; and so it is: but not in the sense they took it, "Colui che spargera il sangue de l'huomo ne l'huomo"—"Qui aura repandu le sang de l'homme en l'homme."—On the whole, I am pretty confident, that I have given the true meaning.

Ver. 8. *My covenant.* בריתי ברית from ברית, in my apprehension denotes a *dole*, or *portion* of any meal. It acquired the meaning of *covenant*, from the mode of verifying a contract among the orientals; which was the communion of *bread* and *salt*.—At this day, when the Druses have contracted with their guests this *sacred* engagement, no event can make them revoke it. See the Remarks on Levit. 2. 13.

Ver. 10. *Every earthly animal.* לכל חית הארץ. This is only a general resumption; לכל here is equivalent to כל.—A sensible writer in a collection of *Commentaries and Essays*, &c. published by Johnson some years ago, suspects that a corruption has here happened in the text; and that the words above quoted are quite unnecessary. "This conjecture (says he) is confirmed by the Septuagint Vatic. which has not this latter clause: and this being omitted, all will be clear and consistent; and the verse will run thus: 'and with every living soul which is with you, with the fowl, with the cattle, and with every beast of the earth with you, of all that have come out of the ark.'"—I believe the reader will find nothing redundant in my version, which is certainly not inconsistent: nor indeed is there any thing redundant in the original. It is a pleonasm, it is true, but a pleonasm frequent not only in Hebrew, but in almost every other language. It is of the same sort as that of verses 2 and 3. Its omission in the Greek of Sep. is not a sufficient reason for rejecting it. One ms. at least has it before *πάντων*; and another ms. with two copies of Armen. have it after *ἐξωστων*; where it stands in the Hebrew. See Holmes's Various Readings.

Ver. 12. The Latin Vulgate, misunderstood, has, I believe, led most modern translators, and among these our own, to mistranslate a part of this verse: "This is the token of the covenant which I make *," *Hoc signum fœderis, quod do*. The Latin is, indeed, ambiguous; because *signum* and *fœdus* are both of the neuter gender; and either of them may be the antecedent to *quod*: and if our translators had used *give* instead of *make*, their version, although apparently ambiguous, would have been susceptible of the genuine meaning. For it is evident from the context that אֶת, not בְּרִית, is the antecedent to אֲשֶׁר. Yet even Dathe himself has followed the common track; without leaving a chance of mistaking him: "Pignus vero illius *pro-missionis quam vobis... dedi*."—Not so the Septuagint: *Ταυτο το σημειον της διαθηκης, ο εγω δίδωμι*. So the Greek of Venice: *το δε το σημειον της ευσθηκης, ο δίδωμι*. So also more explicitly Castalio: *Pignus autem, quo pignore volo hoc, &c.* Hezel, too, has here corrected Luther's version: and Michaëlis has, by a proper arrangement, made his translation clear and complete. "Dis ist das zeichen des bundes zwischen mir, und euch, &c.... das ich ewige zeiten ver ordne."

Ver. 16. Houbigant makes the whole verse a part of the Historian's narrative; and not of God's speech. "Et fuit arcus in nubibus, apparuitque ut monumentum esset," &c. But he

* Bate and Delgado have rectified this mistranslation.

has all the antient versions against him, and all the mss. also; although he presses the Sam. into his service. His great stress is laid upon the word *אלהים*; as if God could not coherently say that he would remember the covenant "between God and all sorts of animals;" but would in that case have said "between me," &c.—But surely the good Father did not here attend to the Hebrew idiom; which most frequently substitutes the person for the pronoun.—Here *God* is equivalent to *me*; and so I have rendered it in my version.

Ver. 18. *Ham (the father of Chanaan)*. This parenthesis is evidently inserted here, to prepare the reader for what follows, ver. 25.

Ver. 20. *Noah began, &c.* It is not necessary to suppose that he had not cultivated the ground before.—He only began anew to cultivate it after the deluge—and, among other agricultural operations, he planted a vineyard; of the grapes of that plantation he expressed wine; and having drunk too much of this wine, the strength of which he did not probably yet know, he was inebriated; and, in consequence of that inebriation, fell asleep in an indecent and naked posture. Such is the substance of the story; than which nothing can be more natural. But our commentators are not content with that. Mr. Julius Bate informs us, that "he lay down" "for a divine dream, which they prepared for by wine; which naturally leads to sleep and dreaming. The earth was now to be divided, and Noah wanted directions from heaven on that head; and had them, as we learn, by what he saw in his dream: it contains the history of the whole world; which would *hardly* have been revealed to a drunken man."—Hardly.

Ver. 22. I have said in my explanatory note, that the crime of Ham seems to have been a voluntary contemptuous inspection of his father's nakedness; and the still more wanton indecency of leaving his father thus exposed. He should certainly have covered him secretly, without communicating the incident even to his own brothers: every filial heart must feel the impropriety of his conduct.

Ver. 25. *Accursed be Chanaan, &c.* Much learned conjecture has been employed to elucidate this passage. Some have imagined that *Chanaan* is here erroneously placed for *Ham*, which is the reading of the Aldine ed. of Sep. and of 7 of Holmes's mss.*—Others suppose that *אביו* *Ham the father of* are wanting before *Chanaan*; and supply them accordingly; partly from the Arabic version (*אביו נכעם*) and partly from the chimerical rules of Hebrew metre, as laid down by Hare.—But neither of these authorities is sufficient to justify an alteration in the present text; in which there is no variety of lection either in the Sam. or Hebr. copies: and with which all the other antient versions perfectly agree. Were this alteration even allowed, it would not much mend the matter: for, if Ham was only to be cursed, why curse him under the denomination of *the father of Chanaan*?

At any rate, to be consistent with themselves as well as with their pretended metrical canons, they should, with the more consistent Arabic translator, insert the same words before *Chanaan* in verses 26 and 27, without which the burthen of the curse, i. e. *subjection to his brethren*, still

* I have sometimes imagined that the reading *Xav*, in the Aldine and other copies, may have arisen from an abbreviation of *Xavaav*; thus *Xav*. The μ and ν , in many Greek mss., are to be distinguished only by the length of the left leg, which in μ is much shorter than in ν : so that this latter actually more resembles our common μ than it does the ν itself of those days: and this mode of orthography is preferred throughout the Greek New Testament of the edition of Alcalá

falls on Chanaan. But this would have been as hostile to their *mère*, by being too long, as the present line is by being too short.

The Text, I think, is sufficiently clear as it stands; and highly expressive of what we may suppose to have been the feelings of Noah on this occasion. On awaking, he learns that Ham has used him most irreverently, while his other sons had shewed him that filial regard which was due to such a venerable father. To express his indignation at so infamous a conduct, he curses Ham in his progeny; and in *him* of his progeny who was, probably, most dear to him, as being his youngest son*, perhaps just then born; and whose very name, which imports the idea of depressive humiliation, might readily offer a paronomasiacal allusion; so common in the maledictions and benedictions of the patriarchs.—Whether this malediction were prophetic or imprecatory; whether it were really made by Noah, or whether the whole be not a post-liminious tale, contrived by the Hebrew historiographer for the purpose of throwing an odium on the Chanaanites, and justifying the conquest of their country; are points which I mean not now to discuss: but it is pretty clear, that the story, true or false, is here introduced, to pave the way for a more special command from Heaven to conquer and extirpate the Chanaanite nations.

Ver. 26. *Blessed of the Lord, my God, be Shem*: “More natural (says Archbishop Secker †) than the common version, *Blessed be the Lord, the God of Shem*: for why should he be the God of Shem, more than of Japheth?”—and I add, than of Ham. The same mode of phrasing occurs chap. 24. ver. 3. “Come in, thou blessed of the Lord;” and Deut. 33. 31. “Blessed by the Lord be his land.”—For the rest, I suspect the word *יהוה* the Lord to be an interpolation ‡.—It is remarkable, that both Arabs have *God*, instead of *the Lord*. Saad. ربنا. Erp. מבורך אללה. אלהי שם.

Ib. *May he dwell in tents of renown*. I have here done what, I doubt not, will be called an audacious deed. I have, contrary to all the copies of the Text, and all the antient versions, transposed a whole comma from one verse to another; and applied to *Shem*, what, in the present arrangement, is applicable only to *Japheth*; or, according to others, to God.—The truth is, I long demurred, in my mind, whether I should risk so bold a transposition: the following consideration, at length, determined me.—To both the other names there is a manifest allusion, or paronomasia: is it credible that there was not one also to that of *Shem*? *Shem* signifies *renown*, *celebrity*, *fame*: the comma שם בנתי שם *may he dwell in tents of renown* ||, is, then, much more applicable to him than to Japheth; especially as the latter has his own proper paronomasia יפת ארצו *May God enlarge Japheth* §: for so I have rendered, in my version, because I then thought that the Greek and Vulgate had properly expressed the meaning by *παρυσσαι* and *dilatet*. I have since sometimes doubted, whether the Arabic of Saadias offer not a better version, *יהוה benefaciat*. The word פתח in Arabic has a nearly similar

* See chap. 10. ver. 6.

† In his ms. Notes on the Bible, at Lambeth.

‡ See the Remark already referred to in the note ‡, p. 50.

§ So, before me, Michaëlis had rendered this comma, although he applies it to Japheth. “Er wohne in berühmten wohnungen.”

§ The word signifies *enlarged*.

meaning, and Dathe has accordingly rendered "Fortunet Deus Japhetum." On the other hand, פָּרַח in Chald. and פָּרַח in Syr. have meanings that seem strongly to support the Greek version: and in the same dialect פָּרַח signifies to *increase greatly*, which is equivalent to *enlarge*. I am therefore still inclined to lean to that side. The Arab. of Erpenius has a word of the same purport, *فَرَح*; and the Greek of Venice has *εφαυω*.—I have hinted that some interpreters make *God* the nominative to *פָּרַח* *may he dwell*: but this is evidently a forced and unnatural explication.

In both verses, I have rendered, *his servant*, on the authority of Sep. Vulg. and Arab. The present Text has *וְלֵב* in both places; and in the second place all the versions, save the three forementioned ones: but in the first place, Jonathan and, what is more remarkable, the Greek of Venice have *his*, *וְלֵב*, *αυτου*. Perhaps we should half the difference, and read *his*, *וְלֵב*, in ver. 26. and *their*, *וְלֵב*, in ver. 27. And, indeed, if the present arrangement be right, and if my transposition be wrong, *וְלֵב* here would be necessary: and the rendering of the Greek of Venice the best of all, *τελων τε Καναν οικησθς σφω*. *May Chanaan be a slave to both*. See Houbigant's note on the place.

C H A P. X

THIS chapter contains a short account of the posterity of the sons of Noah, who, after the deluge, are supposed to have re-peopled the earth. By comparing it with the 27th chapter of Ezekiel, we find that several of the nations, here mentioned, still bore the same names in the days of that prophet. Hence the two chapters serve, in some degree, to elucidate one another. But, with all this light, we are too often obliged to grope our way, with respect to the relative situations of those various peoples; and much more so with regard to their present appellations. A proper name is apt to assume a new form every time it is translated into a different language, and often even in the same dialect at different periods: sometimes to such a degree, that the original term is hardly discernible: and probable conjecture must supply the place of certainty. The labours of Bochart, Le Clerc, Wells, Michaëlis, and Forster, not to mention many other inferior writers, have almost exhausted the subject of this chapter: and little is left for future gleaners: until a more minute description of the Asiatic regions shall be made by a traveller well acquainted with all the various dialects, that are spoken, from the Indus to the Nile, and from the Arabic gulph to the Caspian sea.

I shall here, from the aforesaid writers, and my own observations, lay before the reader a brief notice of the nations supposed to be designed in this geographical genealogy: which, if it were written by Moses, is the most antient fragment extant of the sort.

Ver. 2. *Gomer* is supposed to be the father of the *Cymmerians*, or *Cimmerians*; that is, of the antient *Celts* who dwelled between the Borysthenes and the Tanais, and in the Tauric Chersonesus.—*Magog* is the father of their neighbours the *Scythians* or Tartars—*Madai*, of the *Medes*—*Javan*, of the *Ionians*, or more antient Greeks—*Thubal*, of the *Tibareni*—*Mosboch*, of the *Moschi*.

Ver. 3. *The sons of Gomer*, i. e. the nations descended from him, ~~and~~ *Askenaz*, the inhabitants of Phrygia-Minor and Bithynia—*Ripbath*, or *Depbath*, the ~~Paphlagonians~~ according to Josephus: but the very orthography of the word is uncertain: it being written sometimes with a *resb*, and sometimes with a *daletb*; but in this the authority of Josephus is confident; which is in favour of *resb*.—*Thogarmah*, the *Armenians*.

Ver. 4. *The sons of Javan*, or colonies of Ionia, are *Elisb*, or *Hellas*,—*Tharsibisb*, *Tartessus* in Spain.—*Cethim*, the first inhabitants of *Italy*.—*Rodanim**, the inhabitants of *Gallia Rhodanensis*.

Ver. 5. *From these . . . were the insular nations distinguished*. I have said, in my explanatory note, that the Hebrews so denominated, not only real islands, but, in general, all those maritime or transmarine nations with which their usual communication was by sea.—Michaëlis solves the difficulty another way. From the Arabic *اين*, *to inhabit*, he derives *اين*; and thinks it denotes habitations, or residences, of any sort, whether insular or not. This idea is adopted by Dathe, who renders: "ab his originem habent regionum *exterarum* incolæ."—I cannot easily acquiesce in this interpretation. For, first, although the word *אין* may sometimes be fitly enough rendered a *residence* or *habitation*; it does not from this follow, that such is its original meaning. Every peopled island is an habitation, but every habitation is not an island. 2. The most ancient Greek version has *νῆσοι* †, and the Latin Vulg. *insulae*: and although the Syr. and Chald. may be bended to the same meaning which Michaëlis would give to the Hebrew; they have been generally translated *insule*; and, in some passages, can hardly be translated otherwise. 3. The meaning of the Arabic verb *اين* is too vague and uncertain, on which to found a sure etymon. Itself may be a denominative from some other root; as I believe all verbs, in all languages, to be. Had it been considered by the Arabs themselves as the root of the Hebrew *אין*, it is most probable, that they would in their versions have retained the Hebrew word, or an Arabic word similar to it: whereas both Saadias and Erp. have words denoting islands properly so called; namely *גוזר* and *אמר*.—I am therefore inclined to think that the original meaning of *אין* is an *island*: but that its usage in Hebrew was extended, as I have said, to all those nations which were separated from Palestine, Arabia, and Syria, by seas.—The very word is yet retained in almost all the Teutonic dialects, and still denotes an *island*. Dan. *öe*. Swed. *öo*. Belgic. *ey-land*; and so our Saxon *eg-land* (pron. *ey-land* or *y-land*) which we still find in many compounds, such as *Rams-ey*, *Sheep-ey*, *Hert-ey*, *Eel-y* †. See Junius's Etymologicum, ed. Lye.

Ver. 6. *The sons (or progeny) of Ham were*—*Chusb*, that is, the *Ethiopians*; who first inhabited Arabia and thence colonized Habessinia, by passing over the Red-sea.—*Mixraim* are, no doubt, the *Egyptians*—*Phut*, the *Libyans*—*Chanaan*, the *Chanaanites*, or *Phœnicians*.

Ver. 7. *The sons of Chusb*—*Sebab*, supposed to have inhabited *Meroë*, an island of the Nile—*Havilah*, different from that mentioned ver. 29. and supposed to be the present *Haulan*, or *Chaulan* of Yemen or Arabia Felix—*Sabthab*, placed by Bochart in Persia, but this is highly improbable. Josephus says they were the people called by the Greeks *Αγοσσοι*. Jonathan

* Here again is a variety of lesson *Dodanim*; which Michaëlis takes to be *Epirus*, where was the oracle of *Dodona*. The name is altogether wanting in Josephus.

† So also the Greek of *Venice*.

† And, in Scotland, *L-Colm-kill*.

says they were the *דורק* the Indians. We must look for them, I think, either in Africa or Arabia.—*Raamah*, or *Raghma*, has been supposed to be *Rbagma*, on the Persian gulph: but Michaëlis is inclined to think it is *Reama*, a large mercantile town of Yemen.—*Sabthechab*, whom Jonathan calls *זינגי*, is thought to be the *Zingis* of Ptolemy, between Ethiopia and Egypt.

The sons of Raamah were—*Sbebab*, the *Sabeans* of Arabia, who were afterwards confounded with the Joktanite tribe of the same name.—*Dedan* is the present *Daden*, not far from the mouth of the Persian gulph.—It must be confessed that much of all this is mere conjecture: but, as I mean to treat on the subject in a particular dissertation, I shall here but slightly touch on it, to make room for other more important matters.

Ver. 8. *Chusb was also the progenitor of Nimrod*.—This *Nimrod* is called ver. 9. *נבר ציד*, which is rendered by Sep. *γigas κυνηγος*. Vulg. *robustus venator*. Onk. *גבר חקק*. Tharg. *יבר מרדח*. Syr. * *גברא נחשינא*. Arab. Pol. *نبارا مدح*. Arab. Erp. *نبارا في المصايد*. Pers. *نبار ناهير*. Gr. Ven. *κραταιος θηρακτης*. All which terms are more or less equivalent to our common English version “a mighty hunter.”—He was, indeed, a mighty hunter: but his predations were not confined to the brute creation:

“Proud Nimrod, first, the bloody chase began,

“A mightier hunter—and his prey was man.”

Josephus calls him *τολμαχος, και κατω χειρα γεναιος*, a bold enterprising man, who persuaded the people to throw off the fear of God, and submit to his domination.—Whether he literally hunted them down, like wild beasts, with dogs; or whether it be only a metaphorical expression; it seems clear, that he oppressed and subjugated his fellow creatures, and was, according to our historian, the first despotic tyrant. His very name, which was probably given him after his death, not assumed by himself, denotes an arrogant rebellious man: hence it is well said that he was a mighty hunter (or, as I have rendered, a powerful plunderer) in despite of the Lord *לפני דודא*, i. e. says very properly Rosenmüller, “*vidente et indignante Deo; cujus excusso metu ac reverentia, vi fratrum opprimere genus auderet.*”

Some moderns, however, with Aben-Ezrah, give the whole passage another turn; and imagine that what is here said of Nimrod, is said to his praise. He was a great man, even in the sight of God. But this appears to me a very strained interpretation; although it has been adopted by some learned men †.

Ver. 11. *From that land (the land of Shinar) he went into Assyria*. *מן דארץ שניר || מן דארץ אשור*, which is commonly rendered “Out of that land went Ashur.” *Ex terra illa egressus est Assur*. So all the antient versions save Onkelos and Tharg. Bab. both which render as I have done. The latter in particular is explicit. “Out of that country

* The Syrian writer, Ephrem, says this is a Persian term, unknown to him: and indeed it has much the air of an exotic word: yet I find it not in any Persian vocabulary: and the Persian translator here uses a very different term.

† Sep. adds *God*; but this addition is wanting in 5 mss. and in two copies of the Arab. version, made from Sep.—On the other hand, both the Pol. and Erp. Arab. have *God* instead of *the Lord*.

‡ Such as Hestie, Jerusalem, Vogel, Le Clerc.

§ The present Heb. has *ממנו*, but 10 mss. with the Sam. have the right reading *ממנו*.

"Nimrod went, and reigned in Assyria; . . . and, leaving those four cities, built other four, Ninivé," &c. Bochart and Le Clerc have so well defended this version, that I was forced by conviction to adopt it: although the current of commentators is against us. The only reasonable objection that can be made is, that there is no *n* after *ten*. But it is well known that this affix is not unfrequently omitted, after names of places; and its omission here is not sufficient to overset the probability that Ninivé, and not Ashur, is the nominative to *he egressus est*.—We find no portion of the name of *Ashur*, but the second son of *Shem*, mentioned ver. 22. But to introduce him here confounds the narration; and would be a most ill-placed parenthesis indeed. Whereas, by applying the words to Nimrod, all is clear and contemporaneous. This powerful man, after having erected his *first empire* in the land of Shinar, went out of that land and made himself master of Assyria, where he built four other cities, besides those which he had built in the land of *Shinar*, or *Babylon*. See Bochart, l. iv. c. 12. and what Michaëlis has said against his opinion in his *Spicilegium*, part 1. p. 235, &c.

Ver. 12. *The great city*. I refer this to Ninivé; which, wherever it is mentioned in the Hebrew writings, is so denominated. Michaëlis, who thinks that Ninivé, in the time of Moses, was not a great city, has no doubt of *Resen* being here designed as *the great city*. But I, who nowhere else find either *Resen*, or *Chalab*, called a great city, or even ever mentioned but here, have a very great doubt: so great that I cannot believe that any other city than Ninivé is alluded to. It is not necessary to suppose that Ninivé was a great city in the days of Moses: as it has never yet been proved that this geographical chart was drawn by Moses. At any rate, there is no stronger proof that *Chalab* or *Resen* was a great city in the days of Moses, than that Ninivé was a great city.

Ver. 13. *From Mizraim sprang the Ludites, &c.* We know so little of these peoples, or of their respective habitations, that it seems wiser to pass them over in silence, than risk vain conjecture. Nor is the precise situation even of the Chanaanite nations exactly known: we only learn from ver. 19. their general boundaries: and, with respect to these, the Samaritan copy differs from the Hebrew. See the next remark.

Ver. 19. *From the river of Egypt, &c.* This is the Samaritan reading, which I prefer to the Hebrew, for the following reasons. In the promise made to Abraham, chap. 15. ver. 18, 19, 20, 21. the very same boundaries are assigned to the land of Chanaan in all the copies, which are here marked in the Samaritan: and the same number of peoples, or tribes, included in them. Again, in Exod. 23. 31. the same boundaries are designed in a more particular manner: "from the Red-sea to the sea of the Philistines, (that is, the Mediterranean) and from the wilderness of *Shur* to the great river Euphrates." It is true, this was not accomplished until the reigns of David and Solomon: which latter is expressly said in the first book of Kings, chap. 4. ver. 20. to have had dominion "over all the kingdoms from the river *Euphrates* unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the borders of Egypt."

But whence sprang the present reduction of those boundaries in the Hebrew Text of Genesis? That I know not: but I suspect it arose from this; that when the compiler, or transcriber, of the present copy of the Hebrew Text lived, the boundaries of Judæa had been greatly circumscribed: and he accommodated his text to that circumscription.—But why, then, left he the other two passages unaltered? This, indeed, I cannot account for, nor am I obliged to account

for it. But this I affirm, the present Hebrew text is inconsistent with itself: the Samaritan is consistent: let the reader choose, by whether of the two he will abide.

Ver. 21. *To Shem were sons also born.* לשם ילד גם. These words are rendered by Dathe thus:—"A Semo multæ gentes habent originem," which we might express more briefly "Shem" "had a numerous progeny," or, still more literally in Latin: *Shemo nata est copia*. This version is founded on the Arabic signification of גם; which I render *also*; and it must be allowed that the interpretation is most ingenious. Yet I cannot think, that it was here intended by the original author. If he had meant to denote the multitude of Shem's children, he would, most probably, have used another mode of phrasing: such as בני שם רבו, or לשם ילדים רבים. In no other place of Hebrew scripture, not even in poetry, is גם used in the Arabic signification. Nor is the Arabic signification itself, in my apprehension, applicable to a *numerous progeny* any more than נמץ, of which perhaps it is an abbreviated form. It signifies a *collection*, *heap*, *abundance* of material things; but never, I believe, a *multitude* of men. All the antient translators took גם for a particle. If any of them could have suspected it to be a noun, it must have been the Arabs; and then doubtless they would have retained the word, if their own גם or נמץ had been applicable to a numerous posterity.—But גם seems here a mere expletive!—It is not more so than δε is most frequently in Greek; in which language a literal version of the Hebrew would be Τῷ δε Σεμὶ γεννηταί.—For the rest, I agree with Dathe, that דור is to be constructed with the following אבי, as the Arab. Pol. well renders אבי דור. So the Greek of Venice, although badly pointed in the printed edition, αβὶς δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Νῶε Εἰσεν.

Ib. *Japheth's eldest brother.* אחי יפת הנדל. I have said in my explanatory note, that the common rendering of these words is contrary to grammatical analogy, and only founded on a doubtful chronological hypothesis. Thus it is argued: "When Noah begot his eldest son he" "was 500 years old, Gen. 5. 32. But Shem was 100 years old, two years after the deluge, " Gen. 11. 10. He could not therefore be the eldest son of Noah. Hence we must necessarily render the Hebrew words *the brother of Japheth the elder*."—Must we? Then adieu all rules of grammar! Let such another example of construction be produced from the whole body of Hebrew scriptures; and I shall acquiesce in the interpretation: although I should deem the remark of the writer a very insignificant one. The intention of the writer was evidently to mark the seniority and consequent superiority of Shem. He had already told us, chap. 9. ver. 24. that *Cham* was, if not the youngest, at least the younger son of Noah: he now is careful to tell us that *Shem*, the stem of the Hebrews, was elder than Japheth. This is quite natural: but to tell us that Shem was *the brother of Japheth the elder** is an uncouth mode of expression in any language; and is altogether contrary to the idiom of the Hebrew.—But how is the chronological difficulty to be resolved? I care not whether it be resolved or not: although I think it no arduous task. Every one knows that the centuries marked in the Hebrew annals are not always real centuries. When Shem is said to have begotten Arphaxad, when he was 100 years old; he may have been not only two, but three or more years old than just the hundred.—Wherever the sons of Noah are mentioned together, *Shem*

* The Septuagint version only is favourable to this meaning: but I am persuaded that it is corrupted; and that the true reading is either ἀδελφῶν; which is that of 1 ms. or rather τῷ μαιζωνι (for τῷ μαιζωνος), which is the reading of 7 mss. of the Slavonic and Ostrogothic versions, and of Austin. See Dr. Holmes's Various Readings.

is always put at the head of them. I do not call this a conclusive argument for his primogeniture: but it is a strong presumptive one.—Besides, who will say that the chronology of Genesis is a certain chronology? Who, for example, can easily believe that Noah was full 500 years old, before he begot any children? It is certainly highly improbable.

Ver. 22. *The sons (that is, the posterity) of Shem were:*

Elam. The Elamites, who inhabited the country between Susiana and Media.—*Assur*, the Assyrians, whose capital was Ninivé.—*Arphaxad*, who appears to have peopled that part of Assyria called by Ptolemy Arrapachites. See Schlözer's Memoir *Von den Chaldäern*, in Eichhorn's Repertorium, tom. 8. p. 113.—*Lud* is generally supposed to be the father of the Lydians: so Josephus οὗς δὲ Λυδοὺς καλεῖται. But where was their country? We know no other Lydia but that of Asia Minor, between the river Halys and the Ægean sea; anciently called Mæonia. Michaëlis suspected that the writer meant to describe some nation much farther east; and that the original reading might be *לוד* or *לוד*, that is, *India*, which the Arabs still call *الهند*. The *Ludites* are by Jerem. 46. 9. classed with *Chus* and *Phut*; and by Ezek. 27. 10. with *Pharas* (Persia) and *Phut*. And this is all that we know of the matter.—*Aram* is, doubtless, *Syria*.

Ver. 23. *The sons of Aram were:* *Uz*, the country of Job, is probably that tract of country between Palæstine and Cælo-Syria; called by the Greek translator of Job *Αὐρρις*. The Arabs of the present time, giving a hard sound to the *am*, and changing as usual the *shade* into *teth* or *ta*, call it *Ghauta* *طوت*; Arab. Saad. *ألتوت*. But Arab. Esp. retains the Hebrew word *טו*.—*Hul* is *Armenia*, according to Josephus and S. Jerom. Michaëlis imagines it to be *Cælo-Syria*.—*Gether* is conjectured to be the country bounded by the river *Centrites*, on the borders of Armenia.—*Masb*, *מסב*, called in the Sam. text *מסב*; in Chron. *מסב** (which is the reading of Sep. here *Μασσα*), is supposed with some degree of probability to be the region about mount *Mafus*; from which flows the *Masfa* (*Μαῶσα*) of Xenophon, otherwise called the *Saccoras*; but by the Arabs *Hermas*, *هرماس*. See Michaëlis's *Spicileg.* part 2. p. 141.

Ver. 24. *Arphaxad begot Cainan.* This generation is in neither the Sam. nor Heb. text: nor in any of the antient versions save Sep. and hence it has been generally deemed an interpolation. Dr. Jackson, in the 1st vol. of his *Chronological Antiquities*, labours hard to shew that the reading of the Septuagint is the true original reading, and that it stood in the original copies until after the Christian æra. It is, indeed, hard to say by what means it could have got into the Septuagint version, if it had not been found in their Hebrew copy. It must have been in the copy used by Luke in forming his genealogy of Jesus Christ. In short, it is not easy to conceive how such an interpolation could have been made; or for what purpose: whereas its having been dropt out of the Hebrew text may be readily accounted for.—Such are the arguments in favour of the Septuagint.

On the other hand, the conformity of the Sam. with the Heb. copies; the silence of Josephus and Philo; and its omission in the chronological computations of Julius Africanus, Eusebius, and Theophilus; are urged as cogent proofs that the passage was not in the original copies of the Septuagint: and Grotius goes so far as to assert that it was not to be found there, before the fourth century. But how came it at all to be inserted? Why, it was first foisted

* One of Kennicott's mss. has here *מסב* with a *dalet*; which *dalet* may have been intended for a final *chaph*.

into Luke's gospel by some careless copyist from ver. 37, where it rightly occurs; and this interpolation, being transcribed by other copyists, got imperceptibly into almost all the exemplars: and on these exemplars the copies of the Septuagint were next interpolated, to make them agree with the Evangelist.—This, if not an impossible, is certainly a strange, most rapid, and to me almost an incredible process. For we find this same interpolated *Cainan* in the Syr. Vulg. Arab. and Ethiopic versions.—On the whole, then, I am strongly inclined to think that the comma in question stood originally in the Septuagint version, and that Luke drew his genealogy from that version. The point, indeed, is not worth contending about: and therefore I dismiss it with indifference. The reader may take what side he pleases. It is but fair, however, to inform him, that the comma is wanting in 3 of Holmes's mss. in the Coptic * and Armen. edited copies, and in 1 Arab. ms. Nor was it read by Theophilus; nor by Jerom in his Heb. Questions; where he says (in express terms) “Arphaxad genuit Sela.”

* Verses 26, 27, 28. *Joktan*, *Jethan*, or *Kabtan* † is universally allowed to have settled in *Jemen*, or rather in *Iemen*; and the Arabs at this day acknowledge him for their first patriarch.—His sons were, *Almodad*, of whom I find no trace in the geography of Arabia.—*Shaleph* is, with some degree of probability, supposed to be the founder of the *Salapenian* nation, mentioned by Ptolemy, in the interior of Arabia.—*Hazarmoth* is evidently the Arabic *Hadramuth*, *هذرموث* of *Jemen*. See Busching's Asia, p. 697.—*Jerah* is, according to Michaëlis, the same with *Gobbel-kamar*. This is a mere etymological conjecture: *Jerah* *ירח* in Hebrew, and *kamar* *قمر* in Arabic, signifying *the Moon*. See Busching, p. 704.—*Haduram*. Bochart finds in this name the *Drimati* of Pliny.—*Uzal* is the present *Sanaa* of *Jemen*. See Niebuhr and Busching.—*Diqlab* is placed by Bochart in the country of the *Minæi*: but Michaëlis would place his residence from the mouth of the Tigris (in Syr. *דקלת*) to the Persian gulph.—Of *Obal* and *Abimael* we find no certain traces.—*Sheba* is the country of the *Sabæans*.—Of *Ophir* I shall have occasion to speak in another place.—*Havilah* is very probably the present *Hbailan* or *Cbailan* *هبالان*. See Busching, p. 652.—*Jobab*, the *Jobabites* of Ptolemy; now the district of Hamdan. See Michaëlis; and Busching, p. 689.

Ver. 30. *Amongst the eastern mountains, from Mesha unto Sephar*. The original text is *מִמְּשָׁה בְּמִנְחָה סְפָרָה דָּר הַקָּדִים*; which is commonly rendered “From Mesha, as thou goest, unto Sephar a mount of the east.” So our common version, and so equivalently all the antient versions, with some variety of lection, in the two proper names, hardly deserving to be noticed. Michaëlis, pointing the Hebrew thus, *מִמְּשָׁה בְּמִנְחָה סְפָרָה דָּר הַקָּדִים*, translates or rather paraphrases: “Und ihre wohnungen sind, von Bassora an, bis an Arabische provinz ‘Tahama, die gebürgigten gegenden, die uns gegen morgen liegen.’” More literally Dathe: “Quorum habitationes a Mescha usque ad Sepharam patent; quæ regio montana est versus ‘Orientem.’” Both consider *דָּר הַקָּדִים* as the relative, not of *סְפָרָה*, but of *מִמְּשָׁה*.—Although I have adopted their mode of rendering in my version, I confess that I am not now so fully satisfied with it as I then was. I have some considerable doubt, if such another mode of construction can readily be found: and that in order to justify our versions, the words *דָּר הַקָּדִים*

* This version has *Cainan*; but makes him one of the sons of Shem; and places him after *Aram*.
 † So he is called by the Arabs, *كاتبان*.

† So he is

should stand immediately after מִשְׁבָּה. Yet, what is very remarkable, the author of the Gr. version of Venice seems so to have understood his text : Τηρξὲς δὲ ἡ καθέδρα ὧν αὐτοὶ Ἰσραηλῖται, τὴν ἀπονομήσαντες οὐ Σαβάρη δὲ, ὅπως τὴν ἀντιόχου. — I therefore hesitate between the two translations; and leave the reader to make his own election : although I am rather inclined to believe the more ancient one the better, at least more agreeable to the common rules of Hebrew grammar.

But where are the two boundaries, *Mesba* and *Sepbar*, to be found. To find them is no easy task.—Bochart will have *Mesba* to be the *Musa* of Ptolemy, a celebrated sea-port town on the extremity of the Arabic gulph, or Red-sea; not far from the present port of *Mocha*. Michaëlis objects to this, because the Arabic name is not *mesba* nor even *musba*, but *muzaa* : “*Hæc si vera scriptio nominis Arabici, Mescha Mosis esse omnino nequit.*” This I think too strong an assertion: for, although it is not usual with the Arabs to change *w* into *i*, nor *s* into *y**; who will affirm that this may not have happened in the name of a place? Or who knows if Niebuhr’s informer was a grammarian, who knew perfectly the orthography of *Musa*? The *Musa* of Ptolemy and Bochart is certainly a proper place to be called one of the boundaries of Arabia Felix. But where is the other extremity *Sepbar* to be found? Niebuhr imagined it might be *Dapbar* on the Indian ocean, a sea-port town in the province of *Seger*: and this appears to me the most probable conjecture that has been made: much more probable than that of Michaëlis, who makes *Mesba*, *Misene* or *Bassora*, and seeks his *Sepbar* on the shore of *Thebama*. *Sepbar* in Chald. Syr. and Arab. signifies, indeed, a *shore*. But *Sepbar* here is called a *mountain*, and not a *shore*: at least according to the common, and I now think the better interpretation of the sentence: and the incense mountains in the province of *Seger* may here be alluded to. The only plausible objection of Michaëlis is, that the writer would not, probably, design the boundaries of the Joktanites by two maritime points: “*Si ita limites Jocktanitidis definiret [Moses] idem aut pejus faceret, ac si quis in Germania geographus Hispaniæ fines a duobus portibus describens, Gadibus Tarraconem usque extendi diceret Hispaniam; reliquos terminos, ipsosque montes Pyrenæos omittens.*” But Moses, or whoever made this description, does not profess to give the boundaries of the Joktanites like a German geographer. He only says, their residence was between two points, *Mesba* and *Sepbar*. And, admitting Michaëlis’s own interpretation, the description would be equally defective, considered as a delineation of boundaries: for a line from *Misene* to the *shore* of *Thebama*, cannot better determine the geographical limits of the residence of the Joktanites, than a line from *Muza* to *Dapbar*. But see *Spicileg.* part 2. p. 104, &c.

C H A P. XI.

Ver. 2. FROM their first residence, *מִמֶּנָּה*, which is commonly rendered *from the east*. But it has been objected to this, that if Noah’s sons first settled in Armenia, where the ark is supposed to have rested, the builders of Babel must have proceeded *from the north*, not *from the east*, to the land of Shinar. Hence, Houbigant and others translate *east-ward*, against grammar; and equally liable to objection: for neither is Shinar east-ward from Armenia, nor is it certain that Noah’s

* Which however they sometimes do.

children settled in Armenia: they would, more probably, return to the place in which they had lived before the deluge; if within their reach. The difficulty is better resolved by saying, that the Jews seem to have called *east*, every country that lay between them and the rising sun: not to mention, that, according to some modern relations, the meridian of mount Ararat is at least two degrees more easterly than that of Babylon. All the ancient translators have *from the east*; except Onk. and Perf., who understood קרם in a different sense; namely, the *first* settlement of mankind after the deluge: and this meaning of the word I have preferred in my Version; and rendered, *from their first residence*: which removes every stumbling-block.

Ver. 4. *A tower with its top in the heavens*, i. e. a very high tower: a common Orientalism. See Deut. i. 28.—g. 1.—When Sultan Mahnud Gaznavi invested Canouge in the year 1000, he is said to have seen a city, which raised its head to the firmament. See Pherishta, vol. i. p. 22. quoted by Maurice, vol. i. p. 43.

Ib. *Let us make for ourselves a name-place* נַעֲשֶׂה לָנוּ שֵׁם. Of the various interpretations of this passage, I prefer that of Le Clerc. The hitherto scattered inhabitants of the earth wished to have some permanent settlement; some central town, or metropolis, to which in case of danger they might resort from the surrounding pasturages, whither they might have occasion to lead their herds and flocks: a place, in short, bearing their *name*. The Greek translators render literally *ἑαυτοῖς ἐκείνοις ὀνόμα* and so equivalently the other ancient versions, even the Greek of Venice: which has been generally understood to signify, *Let us make ourselves famous*: or, as the Latin Vulg. *celebremus nomen nostrum*. But this explanation is hardly suitable to the context, even if נַעֲשֶׂה could bear to be rendered *pro*, *antequam*, *before*, as it is rendered in Sep. and Vulg. If they only meant to leave a monument behind them, *before* their dispersion; what need was there for a miracle to disperse them? It is plain that they meant to stick together, and to erect this city and tower as the centre of their union. The Thargumist Jonathan Ben-Uziel took נַעֲשֶׂה to be an idol, placed on the top of the tower or pyramid; and this absurd idea has been adopted by Faber in his *Archæologia Hebræorum*. Perizonius translates נַעֲשֶׂה by *signum*, a *sign*, *mark* or *monument* to be seen at a great distance; and proper for recalling the vagabond hordes to their principal place of residence. That נַעֲשֶׂה may denote a monument, is pretty clear from its Greek derivative *σημα*. See Strabo on the monument of Alexander, p. 794. edit. Paris.—This comes to the same purpose with Le Clerc's and my translation: although I cannot think with Le Clerc that נַעֲשֶׂה is here for נַעֲשֶׂה.

Ver. 5. *But the Lord, having descended*, &c. This descent of the Lord, and his consequent monologue, are nothing more, in my opinion, than a Hebrew mode of expression, denoting that God's will was the cause of the dispersion of mankind from Babel, and of the variety of languages which is then supposed to have taken place. The interpretation of those, who imagine that no difference took place in language, but merely in opinion; which made the builders fall out with one another; is a forced interpretation*.—What Eupolemus and Abydenus say of this famous tower, may be seen in Euseb. *Prepar. Evangel.* l. 9. and the foolish stories about its height, in Calmet's Commentary; or in his Dictionary.

Ver. 13. *Cainan*. See the Remarks on chap. 10. ver. 24.

* See Perizon. Orig. Babyl. c. 9.

Ver. 29. *The father of both Melcha and Ischa.* Why Ischa is here mentioned, or who she was, has puzzled interpreters. It is a very unimportant question. Ephræm takes *Ischa* to be the same with *Sarai*; who was so called on account of her beauty. *Ischa* has that meaning only in the Syr. dialect; and may have been the first name of *Sarai*; before she left Chaldea.

Ver. 31. The present Hebrew Text is here doubly deficient. I have supplied both chafins from Sam. and partly from Sep. In my Various Readings I have mentioned only one copy of Sep. (namely Cott.) as containing the addition, *and Nabor*. I now find this addition in 23 of Holmes's mss.—and 8 mss. have *sons ours* instead of *son ours*, corresponding likewise with Sam. Chrysostom read in his copy *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ*. The Armen. version repeats son in the singular, *Abram his son and Nachor his son*. See Holmes's Septuagint.—The addition of *and Melcha*, which has been omitted to be marked among my Various Readings, is only in Sam.: but when it is considered that Nabor's family settled in Phadan-Aram, where Tharah took up his residence; and that there is no reason to imagine, he would leave any of his family behind, the reading of Sam. must, I think, be admitted as the only true and full reading.

Ib. *Brought them out, &c.* The present Text has *וַיֵּצֵאוּ אֹתָם*, which our English translators render: *They went forth with them*; a disjointed ungrammatical sentence: for what is the antecedent to *אֹתָם*? Or who are *they*, who went forth *with them*? Did Tharah, Abram, Lot, &c. go forth with themselves? The Arabic translator, Saadias, saw the absurdity of this; and, in order to heal the evil, foisted in a word *בְּקִי* *populus, cætus*; which the Latin translator renders *aliquot homines*.—How much better the Syr. who must have read *וַיֵּצֵא* in the sing. “He (that is Tharah) went out with them.”—But still better is the reading of Sam. Sep. Vulg. *וַיֵּצֵא*, or rather *וַיֵּצֵא **, *ἐξήγαγεν, eduxit*.

Ver. 32. *Haran.* In our common version this proper name is spelled in the same manner as Tharah's youngest son Aran: hence some have supposed that he gave his name to the place. But in Hebr. the son of Tharah is written with an *ח*, and the place Haran with an *ר*.

Ib. *One hundred and forty-five years.* I follow the Sam. reading, which is also that of Luke, Act. 7. 4. and reconciles the text of Genesis with chronology. The present reading is 205. This various lection should have been inserted among Various Readings, vol. 1.

C H A P. XII.

Ver. 3. *ALL the human kind.* *כָּל מִשְׁפַּחַת וְדָרָסָה* Lit. “All the families of the ground.” This is supposed by commentators to refer to the Christian dispensation: and the genealogist in Matthew's gospel must have had it in view; in calling Jesus the son of ABRAHAM.—Dawson paraphrases thus: “Thou shalt be proclaimed blest by all nations around thee—all the families of the earth shall bless themselves in thee—shall wish to themselves and friends a prosperity like thine.” It is certain that *all the earth, all the ground*, and such-like terms, imply not always absolute universality, in the Hebrew idiom, or indeed in any other language.

* For such is the genuine Sam. reading, as it is in 4 mss.

All the world, in the mouth of an Englishman, is seldom *orbis terrarum*: it is often a limited world indeed. So that, in strict phraseological propriety, *all the families of the ground* may mean no more than those extensive regions where the name of Abraham was known, and revered. But surely his fame has been much more widely circulated through his son JESUS CHRIST. The benediction therefore, prophetic or not, may justly be applied to him. For the rest, I have rendered the Hebrew words by *all the human kind*, not from partiality to any system; but because I think it should be the endeavour of every translator to retain, if possible, somewhat of the precise and distinctive meaning of the original term:—for *human* has the same relation to אָדָם as *earthly* has to אָרֶץ.—Dathe's version is: "Omnes terrarum nationes per te erunt felices."

Ver. 6. *The Chanaanites were then in the land.* This has been urged as one proof, that this history was written after the expulsion of the Chanaanites: and this, I think, must be granted; or the comma considered as an addition by some posterior scribe. Yet it seems to come in so naturally, as a part of the original narrative, that it is hard to discern the hand of an interpolator. Some modern interpreters have attempted to elude the objection, by giving a meaning to the word אָרֶץ, and a turn to the sentence, which, in my opinion, they cannot bear. They render אָרֶץ by *jam tum, already*; and fancy that the historian meant to say: "The Chanaanites were already in possession of the land." So Dathe: *Chanaanitæ, vero, jam tum terram occuparant.* That is, they had driven out its aboriginal inhabitants, who were Arabian *Scenites* or *Nomades* from the Red-sea: and therefore, says Rosenmüller, the posterity of the *Scenites*, under Joshua, had a right to re-claim and re-conquer their own country: "Ergo Scenitarum posterii, sub Josua, omni jure patriam suam repetere potuerunt."—But I should wish to know where it is recorded, that the Arabian *Scenites* were driven out of Chanaan by the Chanaanites: and, then, by what claim of priority the offspring of Abraham (who surely were not the aborigines) had a right to recover a country which never belonged to their ancestors. For, what connection had the nomadical tribes of Israel with Arabian *Scenites*; who themselves are, without a proof, supposed to have been expelled by the Chanaanites? Truly, this is a strange mode of reasoning.

1b. *The turpentine-tree of Moreh.* אֵלֶךְ מֹרֶה. The Sam. copy has מֹרֶה; which in Sam. vers. is rendered חֲזוֹן *vision*; as אֵלֶךְ is rendered מִסַּד *the vale*. *The vale of vision.*—Sep. מִסַּד חֲזוֹן *the lofty oak*. They are supposed by Schulze to have read מִסַּד for מֹרֶה. I rather think that they had before them the Sam. reading; although they rendered not so literally as they might have done.—Jerom also seems to have read מֹרֶה, since he renders it by *illustrem, ad convallē illustrem*. Onk. Tharg. Jerus. and Arab. Exp. have *the plain of Moreh*: and in this they have been followed by most modern translators †. Yet I very much doubt if ever אֵלֶךְ signify a *plain*; whereas it certainly signifies a tree of some sort or other ‡: and it is my first opinion that it is that species of the oak called *terebintus*, or the turpentine-tree, which lives to a very great age; and seems to have been held in as great veneration in the East, as the common oak was among the Greeks, Romans, Germans, Gauls and Britons. With re-

* The Greek of Venice has likewise ὄρος *δρος*; but makes מֹרֶה a proper name. † In our common English version *oak* is the marginal reading; adopted by Bate and Purver. Pagninus has also *quercum*. ‡ See Isa. 44. 14. Ezek. 27. 6. Hof. 4. 13. Am. 2. 9. in all which places our common version has *oak* or *oaks*. Some translators, from a similarity of sound, have rendered אֵלֶךְ *alnus*, the alder-tree.

spect to the word מוריה I take it for a proper name, and have followed the present Hebr. reading. I have only to add, that Syr. and Arab. Pol. read מוריה; as if this were the same tree that is mentioned in the 18th verse of next chapter. But that tree was by Hebron; this by Sichem.

Ver. 13. *Thou art my sister.* אחותי את. But Sep. אהתי את. *I am his sister.* And so also Syr. אחותי את. They read אחותי את. *Soror ejus ego:* and this reading is perfectly congenial with the Hebrew idiom. Yet all the Hebr. and Sam. mss. and the other versions agree with the text. The sense is all the same.

C H A P. XIII.

Ver. 1. *INTO the south,* &c. דגבורה by Sep. rendered *us. m. m. m. m.* which is, perhaps, the original meaning of the word: but used from its position with respect to Judæa to denote the south, as ים the sea was used to denote the west. Houbigant is here unjust to the Vulgate, and still more so to Le Clerc.

Ver. 2. *Rich in cattle.* במקנה. Although cattle was no doubt the principal possession of Abram, yet the word comprehends every other acquisition, *slaves, substance, tents, &c.* The present Vulgate has here a reading different from all the others. *In possessione auri et argenti,* “in the possession of gold and silver.” This cannot be of Jerom, who in Q. Heb. translates *in pecore, et argento et auro.* Perhaps the original reading of Vulg. was *in possessione, argento et auro.* For the rest, the word *Abram*, which is wanting in Clement’s edition, was in 6 of Hentenius’s mss. and in the copy of Rabanus Maurus.

Ver. 5. *Tents.* So the original and all the versions; save Sep. of which the editions of Compl. Ald. the Alex. and 17 other mss. with Chrysost. and the Armen. version have *πηνη* instead of *πηνη*, which is the reading of the Vatican edition. One of Holmes’s mss. has both, *πηνη και πηνη*.—It was a mistake in Montfaucon to say that there is nothing in the Greek for the Hebrew *און*. The word *πηνη* corresponds with it. See Scharfenberg’s *Animadversiones*.

Ver. 6. *That together they could not dwell.* The Ald. and Rom. editions of Sep. repeat here the reading of the former comma *και ουκ εχοντες αυτες η γη*, &c. But Cod. Alex. and three other mss. have *ου εδυνατο:* and 21 mss. with Complut. * have *ουκ εδυνατο.*

Ver. 10. *Like a divine paradise.* כן ידו. Lit. *a garden or paradise of the Lord.* The meaning is sufficiently explained in the next comma: *like the land of Egypt*, i. e. a fat fertile soil, and watered occasionally by the overflowings of the Jordan. Houbigant will have it, that the garden here alluded to is the primeval paradise of Adam; and too rashly asserts, that the word *ידו* is never found like *אלדים* as an augmentative. Had he forgotten or overlooked Ps. 104. 16. where the cedars of Lebanon are called *the trees of the Lord*? Besides, how are we sure that the original reading here was not *אלדים*? All the copies of Sep. save one, have *α Θεου*, of God; and so has Syr.—not to mention both Arabs; who both seem sometimes, the latter frequently, to have substituted the one word for the other, contrary to their originals. All the other

* Holmes classifies Complut. with those which have *εδυνατο*: but he was misled by Bos, who is frequently an unsafe guide.

versions read דרור; nor is there any variety of lection in either the Hebr. or Sam. copies. It is worth remarking, that, in the rendering of this verse, almost all modern translations lead to a wrong meaning from a faulty arrangement: making Zoar relate to the land of Egypt; whereas it is mentioned as the extremity of the plain of the Jordan. The revised French Geneva version has well expressed the meaning: "qui étoit, avant que l'Eternel eût détruit Sodome et Gomorre, arrosée par tout jusqu'à ce que tu viennes en Tsoar." And, more elegantly, Houbigant: "Ea autem, priusquam Sodomam Gomorramque Dominus deleret, erat, quo itur Segor, tota irrigua," &c.

Ver. 11. *Eastward*. In the Hebrew it is מִקְדָּם *from the east*: and so all the ancient versions, save Onkelos, Arab. Pol. and Pers. But this is contrary to the topographical situation in which the two patriarchs then were. Hence, some critics have imagined that מִן or מִן may sometimes signify *versus, toward*: but of this, I find, they bring no satisfactory proofs. It is better then to suppose that the original reading was בְּקֶדֶם, or simply קֶדֶם, as Saadias seems to have read: as he renders אֱלֵי מְלִשְׁשָׁק; or, with Onkelos, give to קֶדֶם another meaning בְּקֶדֶם; as if Lot had been *the first* to depart. In fact, Abram is said, in the next verse, to have remained where he was.—I have sometimes thought that מִקְדָּם might be rendered *a prima luce: at early morn*; according to the meaning of the word in the Chald. and Sam. dialects: but I find no such acceptation in pure Hebrew: which, however, is not an altogether sufficient ground for rejecting its probability. The Persic translator appears to have understood his text, in a sense little different from Onkelos.

Ver. 18. *Abram then proceeded*. The present Hebrew text has וַיֵּצֵא אַבְרָם, which in our common translation is rendered "and Abraham removed *his* tent." So Sep. *ἐκκέντησεν*, and Vulg. *movens tabernaculum*. But וַיֵּצֵא, I apprehend, never signifies to *unpitch*, or *remove a tent*. Hence the Arabic translator was so embarrassed, that he makes up the meaning thus: פָּחַם פָּחַם אַבְרָם מְדִינָה מְדִינָה he "pitched his tent, station after station, until he came, &c." Onkelos, the Thargums, the Persic translator, Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. have all words which signify to *pitch*, not to *remove* a tent.—This reading, then, must have been an early corruption of the Hebrew text: for a corruption I cannot help deeming it; and think the original reading was וַיָּחַ, which is still the reading of 3, perhaps 4, Sam. mss.; and which might be more easily changed into וַיֵּצֵא than the edited Sam. וַיֵּלֶךְ, which, however, is no bad reading. It is remarkable that in one of Kennicott's mss. [75] the writer seems to have some such word as וַיָּח before him: for thus be copies וַיָּח וַיֵּצֵא. Whence could he have that וַיָּח, if there was no such word, either in whole or in part, in his exemplar? וַיָּח וַיֵּצֵא makes not only a plain sense, but is perfectly consonant with the context. God had bidden Abram traverse the whole land. He instantly begins his progress: *he began, and went*. So Gen. 9. 20. וַיָּח וַיֵּצֵא. My translation suits either of the two Sam. readings; and even the present Hebrew, if וַיֵּצֵא be allowed to signify *decamp*, or *to remove a tent*.

1b. *The turpentine tree of Mamre, by Hebron*. It is clear that the two last words could not be written by Moses: for the name of Hebron, in the time of Joshua, was Kirjath-Arbah. See Le Clerc.—For the rest, there was, in the days of Josephus, a terebinth of a very great size, about six furlongs from Hebron, which was supposed to be coeval with the creation. *τερεβινθος μεγαυτη, και φωνη το δενδρον απο της κτισεως, μεχρι νυν, διαμενεν*. De Bell. Jud. l. iv. c. 9. No. 17.

C H A P. XIV.

Ver. 1. *AMRAPHEL king of Shinar, &c.* It is not easy to determine the respective residences of these kings, or emirs: nor is it of much importance. Those, who wish to see what is most probable concerning them, may consult Bochart, Lightfoot, Spanheim, Michaëlis, &c.: I shall only remark, that Jerom renders *Elazar* by *Pontus*; and *Gorm* by *Gentium*, after Sep. And so Onk. Tharg. Arab. Perf. and even the Gr. of Venice βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν. The deceased Mr. Street imagined, that *Tidal* might be commander in chief, and that the expression תִּדַל נָח might be equivalent to Homer's Ἀνὴρ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων. But in this expedition Chedorlaomer seems to have been the chief: the others were only his associates.

Ver. 3. *In the plain of Siddim* בְּעֵמֶק שִׁדְדִּים. The antient interpreters vary greatly in translating these words. Sep. ἐν τῇ περὶ τοὺς ἁλῶνας *. Vulg. after Sym. and Theod. *ad vallem illustrem*; Onk. וְלִישָׁר וְקִלְיָא; and so equivalently Arab. Pol. פִּי שָׂר מְלֻחָל in the mead-land fields. And Arab. Erp. מְלֻחָל שָׂר מְלֻחָל. The Syr. has מְלֻחָל שָׂר מְלֻחָל in the vale of the Sodomites. He seems to have read מְלֻחָל. Perf. and Gr. Ven. retain the Hebrew word; which I have also done with our common version, Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, &c.

Ver. 5. *Of Ashteroth-Carnaim* בְּעֵמֶק קַרְנַיִם. So the Text and almost all the antient versions. But Sep. Vat. and Syr. make Carnaim the name of a separate place. Did they find a *vau* before קַרְנַיִם? or did they supply one? The latter is more probable: as there is no variety of lection either in Sam. or Hebr., and as the *vau* is wanting in 26 mss. and in all the other editions.

Ib. *The Zuzites of Ham.* הַזִּזִּים בְּחָם. So the present Text with a *he* in בְּחָם. but 7 Sam. mss. have בָּחָם with a *beth*: and this must have been the reading of Jerom's Hebr. copies. "Pro *BAEM*, says he, pro quo dixerunt (70) ἀμα αὐτοῖς, hoc est *cum eis*, putaverunt scribi per *HE*, "ducti elementi similitudine; quum per *HETH* scriptum sit." Q. Hebr. The Vulgate, however, follows the reading of Sep.; but this is no proof, as Martianay will have it, that Jerom is not consistent with himself †. It is only a proof that the Vulgate is not throughout the version of Jerom. Yet all the other versions seem to have read חָם, although in general they make it a proper name. The Sam. version has בְּלִיבָא in *Lisba*: which is probably the same with לִיבָא *Lajb* of Jud. 18. 7. This name, which signifies a *Lion*, agrees well with its inhabitants זִזִּים, which signifies a brave lion-like people: rendered by Sep. ἐθνη ἀρχαῖα. by Syr. עֲשִׂינָא. I have retained both names in their original form: but read בְּחָם not בָּחָם. It may be the same with חָמָת in Num. 13. 21. which in 3 Sam. mss. is written with an *he*. May not Onkelos and Jonathan have this in view, when for חָם, or חָם, they wrote חָמָת, or perhaps חָמָתָא?

Ver. 6. *The Horites of the mountains of Seir.* בְּחַרְרֵי שֵׁעִיר. So reads Sam. followed by all the versions; save Arab. Erp. who seems to have read either בְּחָר, or בְּחָרְר with one of Kennicott's mss. and the Gr. version of Venice, which follows the present reading בְּחַרְרֵי ἐν τῇ ὄρει αὐτοῦ; *in their own mountain.* Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe all follow the Samaritan reading.

* For *em*, 13 mss. have *em*; and for *ἀλωνα*, 3 mss. with Compl. have *ἀλωνα*. † "Non videtur Hieronymus hic sibi satis constare, quia ipsemet in sua Latina Translatione Bibliorum legebat בָּחָם *in eis*, vel *cum eis*."

Ver. 7. *All the low country.* אֶת כָּל שָׂדֵה, or rather כָּל שָׂדֵי, in the plural, as Onkelos and Jonathan must have read in their copies, with one of Kennicott's mss. The Greek and Syriac translators also read in the plural, not שָׂדֵה indeed, but שָׂדֵי *princes*, τοὺς ἀρχοντας, רִשְׁנָה, and this is no improbable reading. It was, perhaps, that of Saadiah. But Arab. Erp. Perf. and Gr. Ven. read שָׂדֵה in the singular.

Ver. 9. *Four kings.* That is, the four last mentioned, against the five former. Hence Cod. Alex. has well rendered τεσσαρες οὗτοι βασιλεις: *these four kings.*

Ver. 10. *Fell there.* יָפְלוּ שָׂמָּה; or as Sam. יָפְלוּ שָׁם. Houbigant, with Amama, Oleaster, and others, imagined that שָׂמָּה cannot mean *there*, but *into*. "Nam שָׂמָּה habet motum. Narrat " Moses eos quinque reges in puteos cecidisse, non autem in pugna cecidisse propè puteos. Ita " rem accipere Græci interpretes, ἐν πύτοις * εἰσι, incederunt illuc." There is great good sense in this observation; and I had once, myself, so translated; not so much from the supposed signification of שָׂמָּה, which has often the same meaning with שָׁם, the Sam. lection, but because the king of Sodom, who is here said to be one of those who fell, is, ver. 17. alive, and meets Abram. But, on further reflection, I now think that the present version, *there*, may be justified. The kings are said to *fall*, when they are defeated: and we are just after told that a part escaped.—Yet still I balance between the two interpretations.

Ver. 12. *All his riches.* כָּל רִכְשׁוֹ. The first word is only in the Sam. text and version, as I have marked it in Various Readings. There is a seeming transposition of the words of this whole verse, noticed by Houbigant; who would thus arrange them. וַיִּקְרָא אֶת לוֹט' בֶּן אֲבִיר אֲבִיר' וְאֶת כָּל רִכְשׁוֹ וַיִּלְכּוּ. He should have gone further, I think, and inserted וְאֶת כָּל רִכְשׁוֹ either after לוֹט', or before וַיִּלְכּוּ. But although it must be allowed, that this order is more natural, I would not positively affirm it to be the original one. The present text, although embarrassed, is clear enough to be properly understood. The difference of arrangement in Sep. and Syr. may not be owing to a difference in their copies from the present Hebrew. The Genevans, Diodati, and even our English translators make a still greater change in their respective arrangements: although they certainly found the original as it now stands.—That the critical reader may not imagine, that I have, in my version, omitted the second וַיִּלְכּוּ, he is desired to observe that, although seemingly redundant, it is however fairly included in the words "they took away with them."—Were I allowed, indeed, to make a very natural and slight alteration in the Text, I should be very much inclined to place וַיִּלְכּוּ after וְאֶת כָּל רִכְשׁוֹ, and make it the beginning of next verse: "When they were gone," &c.

Ver. 14. *He mustered.* With Houbigant, I follow the Sam. reading יָקַד, not יָקַד the reading of the present Hebrew, out of which philology has hardly been able to squeeze a tolerable meaning. Hear only Rosenmüller: "יָקַד, quod propriè denotat vacuum esse, et in Hiphil vacuum esse fecit, eduxit, expromisit; hoc loco armare significat; quia arma depromuntur ex armamentariis vel thecis, si milites ad prælium educuntur." If this interpretation satisfy the critics, I am content: but I am much better pleased with the Sam. reading; which, in all probability, was that of Sep. who render ηρμηνεύει, *be numbered*. So Vulg. *numeravit*. So Arab. Erp. עָדַד†: and so, I think, the Persic version ought to be understood. What was read by the other translators, it is hard to say. They seem to have guessed at a meaning, that should

* Sixteen mss. have *enumeravit*.

† Not עָדַד, as Houbigant has transcribed.

be suitable to the context—except Gr. Ven. who certainly read $\pi\rho\kappa$, and literally renders it $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.—The Sam. reading $\pi\rho\kappa$ then appears, to me, to be the true reading. The verb $\pi\rho\kappa$ in Chaldee signifies to *make a diligent review*, to *suppute with accuracy*; in a word, to *muster*; and it seems to have a similar meaning in both the Syr. and Arab. dialects.

Ib. *His tried domestics*. $\text{אֶת דִּבְרֵי יִלְדֵי בֵּיתוֹ}$. It is not easy to ascertain the radical meaning of דִּבְרֵי . It occurs but 18 times, in any form, in Hebrew Scripture; and, in most of these places, signifies to *initiate*, or some such term. Nor is that signification here inept. Abram's domestics were *initiated* in the art of war; *tried* and *expert* in the use of arms. The ancient versions vary in their renderings, but they may be mostly reconciled to this meaning. Sep. indeed, has דִּבְרֵי : but I suspect this word has here a peculiar meaning, and signifies somewhat more than *suos* or *proprios*. It may have the same meaning with ιδωνος , or the Latin *idoneos*; of which, perhaps, it is the root. Be that as it may, the Latin Vulg. has *expeditos*, no improper term. Onkelos and Jonathan have a word, that is commonly rendered *juvenes*: but which I take to mean more than that; namely *juvenes, adultos, fortes, ad ministerium aptos*; youths of a superior sort, robust expert young men*; or, as Jonathan well explains it, $\text{עַלְמֵי דְחַיִּי לְקִרְבָּא}$, *youths, whom he had trained to war*†. To the same purport Saadias, נֹדָחָה , *his trusty ones*. Arab. عِزْبَانَا (from عِزْب) *his military*. Perf. דִּבְרֵי *ministers*. In fine, the Greek of Venice has the very word we want, $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ αυτου.—So that, whatever be the radical meaning of the word, which I take to be *habena, a bridle*: not a bridle like our modern bridles: but a cord, halter, or *hank*‡ tied about the heads of animals to train them to duty. Hence metaphorically, to *train up* men to any profession.

Ver. 18. *Melchizedek, the king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine*. It is hardly conceivable that this passage, so simple, and readily understood, should have given rise to one of the most violent controversies between the Protestants and the Romanists. The latter would have it that the bread and wine, brought forth by Melchizedek, were not for the refreshment of Abram and his associates; but a real sacrifice offered to God, and an early type of the sacrifice of the Mass §. The Protestants, on the other hand, could see nothing of all this in the text, and indeed they had good reason: although the Catholics had the fathers, even Jerom himself, on their side. The reader, who chooses to see how the controversy was carried on, may consult Bellarmine, Whitaker, Martin on the Douay Bible, Mercerus, Amama, &c. It is but just to observe, that several of the most learned Catholics even then gave up the point; such as Cajetan, Andradius, Oleaster: and now I believe there is hardly one who would seriously defend it. “Ideo (says Houbigant) Melchisedech sacerdos Dei altissimi nuncupatur, quia benedixit Abrahamo; non quia panem et vinum protulit.—Ita rem accepit Paulus in Ep. ad Hebræos.” See Josephus, Ant. l. i. c. 10. n. 2.

Ib. *Priest of God the supreme*. Although I have thus translated, according to the import of the word עֹלֵךְ , it would, perhaps, have been more proper to leave the word untranslated *the*

* See Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. † The Targum of Jerusalem has מַרְבִּי : but Buxtorf shews that this is an error: and that the true reading is מַרְבִּי ; which denotes more than mere domestics, it denotes *special select well instructed servants*.

‡ This appears to me to be the very original word. § Their argument was drawn from the Vulgate version: which runs thus: “At vero Melchisedech rex Salem, proferens panem et vinum, erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi, benedixit ei,” &c. The stress was laid on the word *enim*: which indeed should have been *autem* or *et*. So Sep. $\text{וְהָיָה דֵּעֵי הַפָּאנִים}$ and so all the other versions.

God Elion; as I have little doubt of that being the name of Melchizedek's God, and probably of the people whose king he was; for he was, like Virgil's Annus, both king and priest, according to the usage of antient times.

Ver. 19. *He blessed Abram*. I have omitted, it appears, to mark among my Various Readings that the word *Abram* is added on the authority of Sam. and Sep.*

Ver. 24. *Aner*. אָנֶר. The Sam. copy has here and in ver. 13. Anram אנרם, and Sep. has אַנְרָא †. That *Aner* is the true reading appears from Josephus; who has Ἐνναρος.

C H A P. XV.

Ver. 1. *IN a vision*. Sep. Ald. and one of Holmes's mss. add *νυκτός*, of the night.

1b. *And very great shall be thy reward*. וְשֶׁכֶרְךָ הָרַבָּה מְאֹד. I add the *van* on the authority of 9 Sam. mss. Vulg. and Armen.—The Sam. copy instead of *הָרַבָּה* has *אֲרַבָּה*, “I will make thy reward exceeding great,” a reading of the same import, and almost equally probable.—That a translator from the Latin Vulgate, unacquainted with or inattentive to the original, should thus render: “I am thy protector and thy reward exceeding great,” is not very strange, as the ambiguity of the Latin phrase admits that meaning; and so the Douay translator renders it: but that our last English translators should have fallen into that mistake, is not so easily accounted for; especially as they had not only the Septuagint and other antient versions, but prior English translations to point out the right road. But they implicitly followed the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles; and retained not, even in the margin, the better rendering of Tyndal, and Cranmer's Bible.—Even the Latin Vulg. itself, when properly pointed, is susceptible of the true meaning. “Ego protector tuus: et merces tua magna nimis:” *erit* being understood.

Ver. 2. *Lord, God!* The present Text has אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה, *My lord the Lord*; or *My lord Jehovah*. I preferred the reading of Vulg. Syr. Onk. and 4 mss. which have יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים. But when I so translated, I had not seen Dr. Holmes's Various Readings of the Septuagint; nor, at that moment, considered the impropriety of putting יְהוָה in the mouth of Abram, to whom, if we believe the Lord himself speaking to Moses ‡, the term was not known. I am now fully convinced, that the true original reading was, either simply אֲדֹנִי *my lord*; or אֲדֹנִי אֱלֹהִים *my lord God*. It is true, the Septuagint have Δεσποτὰ Κυρὰ in all the printed editions, save that of Alcalá: but Κυρὰ is wanting not only in this edition, but in not less than 24 of Holmes's mss. and in the antient Coptic version. Nor was it read by Philo, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Gennadius: and, what is still more remarkable, it is wanting in the Greek of Venice; which has only δεσποτὰς μου. All this is in favour of אֲדֹנִי only.—Yet I am more inclined to think that אֲדֹנִי אֱלֹהִים *my lord God* is the genuine reading: and this reading may have been that which Jerom and the Syriac translator found in their copies: for the words Domine, סִרְיָא, are used by them to express אֲדֹנִי as well as יְהוָה §. With respect to אֱלֹהִים, it was read not only by Jerom, Syr. and Onk. but also by both Arabs. Tharg. and Perf.; and is in one of Kenni-

* That is, of Sep. Vat. Ald. and Alex. for 4 of Holmes's mss. have *αυτον*. And 1 ms. with Ed. Compl. have *αυτον* Μαλχαρισσα. † Compl. only has *Avap*; not, as Holmes has it, *Avpa*. He was not here misled by Bos, who quotes rightly. ‡ Exod. 6. 3. § See ch. 18. 3, 27, 30.

eott's mss. without either מֶלֶךְ or מֶלֶךְ. I desire my version to be corrected thus: *My lord God.*

Ib. *And he, to whom I must leave all, is that Damascus, Eleazer.* מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ. This is a very difficult passage, and has given much trouble to commentators. The great desideratum is to ascertain the true meaning of the word מֶלֶךְ, which occurs but thrice in the Bible *, and begets obscurity every time it occurs: nor is it certain that in each of these places it is derived from the same root: and, indeed, the sense that might suit one passage, can hardly be made to suit another †. Here, therefore, we must be contented with collecting what rays of light we can from the context and the antient versions. In the most antient of these, the word is considered as a proper name, and the passage rendered thus: ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μωσὲν τῆς οικουμένης μου, οὗτος Δαμασκὸς Ἐλεάζαρ ‡. They supposed *Masek*, or *Mefek*, to be one of Abram's female domestics, whose son was destined to be his heir, in case he should have no children. The other Greek versions, supposed to be those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, are υἱὸς τοῦ ποτιζόντος—συγγενὴς—καὶ πατήρ all vague conjectures. Onk. בֶּר פֶּרְסָא, and Tharg. בֶּר פֶּרְסָא. *filius sustentationis*, the man who provides for the house; and so equivalently Perf. and Arab. Erp. Vulg. *filius procuratoris*. Sam. version, בֶּר מְדַבֵּר *the man of business*, the *steward*. Saadias מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ *ipse regens*, to the same purport.—The Syriac translator either found not מֶלֶךְ in his copy, or omitted to render it.—Finally, the Greek of Venice has this remarkable reading, υἱὸς τῆς ἀρεσκείας; which may be rendered *the son of election*: and if I could find in any of the oriental dialects a similar meaning in any of the following roots מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶךְ, or מֶלֶךְ, I should without much hesitation prefer this version to all others.—But the truth is, all the antient translators seem to have made the best conjectures they could: and, perhaps, the Syrian did better to leave the word out altogether, than give it an uncertain meaning.

Let us now see how modern critics have disposed of it.—Those who derive the word from מֶלֶךְ, render it *filius cursitationis*, *the son of cursitation*: a proper appellation, say they, for a *steward*; who is constantly *running about* in the discharge of his duty.—Others derive it from the Arab. مَلِك, which signifies *to arrange*, or *set things in order*. Hence מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ will be *the son of order*; or chief ruler of the house.—Others, making מֶלֶךְ itself the root, and finding one signification of that word, in Arabic, to be *properare*, *to hasten*, imagine that מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ may denote *vir properus et diligens*; a *diligent steward*, who goes *expeditiously* about his affairs.—Others, supposing that מֶלֶךְ signifies *to leave*, interpret מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ *filius relictionis*; i. e. he to whom the inheritance is *to be left*.—Although I am far from thinking, that this signification of the word is unquestionable, I have adopted it in my version; as the most agreeable to the context: for it seems clear from the tenor of Abram's speech, and the order of the Hebrew words, that מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ signify something synonymous to an *heir*.—I once thought the true meaning of the word מֶלֶךְ might be found in the Æthiopic *Sbuk*; which denotes the *stay* or *support* of a house. This would certainly make a good sense here: but as it has no such meaning in any of the other sister dialects, I durst not admit it into my translation. I have taken no notice of Schul-tens's *peclinare*; because I think it an absurd derivation. On the whole, it is better to confess one's ignorance, than to affirm for certain, what is but barely probable.

* Namely, 1f. 33. 4. and Zophan. 2. 9. and here.

† See c. 2. on the respective places.

‡ The various readings, in Holmes, are here of no importance.

Ver. 6. *Who accounted it to him for righteousness.* ויחשבה לו צדקה; which Sep. and, from them, St. Paul render καὶ ελογώθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, *It was accounted to him, &c.* So also passively, Vulg. *reputatum est illi ad justitiam* *. I, with Arab. Perf. Tharg. Pagninus, Castalio, and our common version, take the word actively; and have rendered accordingly. The meaning is well expressed by Saadiah כתבדא לה חסנה, *he ascribed it to him, a good deed.* He numbered it among the other tests of his piety and religion.—This text has been a subject of much warm altercation between the Popish and Protestant controversialists: in which the latter, in my opinion, were fairly worsted.

Ver. 9. *An heifer of three years, &c.* עגלה בשלש. Sep. δαμαλιν τριετιζουσαν. Vulg. *vaccam triennem*: and so all the antient versions, save Onk. and Perf. which, instead of a *three years old heifer*, have a *triple-heifer*, or *three heifers* †. And this is the interpretation of Sol. Ben Jarhi, D. Kimbi, and other Jewish commentators. “The Hebrew word משלש, says Delgado, means *threefold*, as in Eccles. 4. 12. I do not know who informed the English translator, that they [the heifer, the goat, and ram] were to be three years old, rather than three months or three weeks.” I will tell him who informed the English translator, and every other translator, who renders as he doth.—The Septuagint, who certainly knew the purport of the word better than Jarhi, Kimhi, or Delgado—the learned Jew Josephus, who renders in the same manner—the Syr. and both Arabs, who were all well acquainted with the idiom of the Hebrew language—the Thargum of Jonathan, who expressly renders עגלה ברית שלש שנים—and the Text of Isaiah 15. 5. where עגלה שלשה cannot, certainly, mean *three heifers*, but one *full grown heifer of three years*: as the Thargum on that place well renders it.—But עגלה שלשה in Eccles. is a *triple cord*. True; but it is only *one cord*, composed of *three plies*, just as the heifer’s age is made up of *three years*. The משלש of Ezek. 42. 6. is to be understood in the same manner; a building of *three stories*. The animals here mentioned are, at three years, in the prime of their life, and then reputed perfectly fit for victims ‡.

Ver. 13. *Will reduce them into slavery.* Our translators, following the reading of the present Text, render “and shall serve them.” But, as Delgado well observes, the nominative here must be the people of the land in which they are to be strangers, and the pronoun *them* אֹרְכֵם must refer to the *seed of Abram*. He thinks that עבדום is here עבדו בהם *they shall serve themselves with them*. Why not rather ויעבדום; which, I have no doubt, was the original reading? Sep. δούλωσαν αὐτούς. Vulg. *Subjicient eos servituti*. Arab. يستعبدونهم *shall enslave them*. They all read in *Hebhel*, or the coöctive voice. And so equipollently, Syr. and the Thargums.

Ver. 15. *Shall have been buried in a good old age.* תקבר בשיבה טובה. Sep. τραπεζης ἢ ἐν γῆρι || καλῶ: a very early corruption, since it is in both the Italic and Coptic versions; and what is

* So also Syr. and Onk. as translated in the Polyglott: but that translation, I think, is wrong; and both, as well as Tharg. should be rendered actively. The Gr. of Ven. renders passively λελογισται αὐτῷ δι δικαιοσύνης. † So also Gr. Ven. δαμαλιν τριετην.

‡ I cannot here refrain from transcribing the excellent observation of Rosenmüller. “Ratio autem cur Dens animalia tria esse voluerit, sine dubio hæc fuit, quia tali ætate hæc animalia in pleno robore et vigore ætatis sunt. Chrysostom. Hom. 26. in Genes. τριετιζοντα λαβεῖν προσεταξε, τὸν ἑστὶ, τελεία ἀγριότητα. Sic apud Lucian. in Deorum Dialogis, Ganymedes a Jove raptus, et demitti petens, pro αὐτῷ suo promittit se Jovi immolaturum arietem τὸν τριετην, τοῦ μαγαν, ὃς ἔχεται πρὸς τὴν νομην.” § Three mss. have τραπεζης.

|| Nineteen mss. have γῆρι.

very remarkable not one of Holmes's mss. has the true reading of Compl. ταφης. Excellent is the version of Aquila, ταφης εν πολλοις αγγελος. So also Gr. Ven. ταφης η τ' αγγελος. Χρησι.

Ver. 18, 19. On the boundaries of Judæa, and every question relative to the geography of that country, I shall copiously treat in my General Preface.

C H A P. XVI.

Ver. 12. "THIS verse (says Delgado) in the English translation is not intelligible:"—a strange assertion. To me it is perfectly intelligible: and to every one, I presume, it will appear more intelligible than that which he would substitute: "His hand shall be *in all*; and the hand of all shall be *in him*."—The version of Schulze, though not literal, is elegant and expressive: "omnium adversarius, ab omnibus vicissim infestabitur."

Ib. *In the face of all his brethren*, &c. The word *brother* in Hebrew denotes every kind of relation. By the mother's side, her Egyptian relations were his brothers; by the father's side, the posterity of Abraham. To both the Ishmaelites were conterminous. Hence his residence is said to be *in the face of all his brethren*, על פני כל אחיו.—Dathe thinks the words על פני should be rendered *ab oriente*, to the east of all his brethren. I doubt, if the words will bear such a version.

Ver. 13. *The visible God*, &c. This is a very difficult passage, which various attempts have been made to elucidate. The present Hebrew runs thus, ותקרא שם דעה ודבר אליה אלה אלה אל ראי, which our translators render: "And she called the name of the Lord, that spake unto her, Thou God 'seest me.'" Le Clerc and Houbigant consider *ראי, not as the participle benoni; but as a verbal noun, and render *Tu es Deus visionis*; i. e. *visibilis*. So Michaëlis: "Du bist der 'Gott des sehens.'" I understand ראי or ראה in the same sense; but I divide the words thus †ראי את דאל ראי; making את the usual mark of the accusative, and ה the prefix to אל. I know not if Dathe so divided; but he has rendered as if he had. "Vocavit Jovam cum ea colloquenter, *Deum visionis*."—This arrangement, and this translation, are evidently more agreeable to the context; and have more of the Hebrew idiom in them than the present reading, and common rendering of the words.—But all the difficulty is not yet got over. The following words, explicative of the former, have, in my opinion, been generally misunderstood. They run thus in the Text: כי אמרה: הנה הלא ראיתי אחרי ראי which in our vulgar translation is rendered: "For she said: Have I also here looked after him that seeth me?" which version if any one understand, I shall admire his acuteness. The Latin Vulgate has at least an intelligible rendering: "Dixit enim: Profectò, hinc vidi posteriora videntis me ‡." He had, no doubt, in view a passage in Exod. 33. 23. where God is represented as shewing his *back only* to Moses. The Septuagint either read not or disregarded אחרי, unless we suppose that they expressed it by εωρων; which is not at all improbable: for אחרי and אחרי not only signify *behind*, but *beside*, *by*. And the Coptic version seems to have so understood the Greek. In this, then, I agree with them; and have willingly adopted their version, but interrogatively. Καί

* The Sam. copy has ראה, which perhaps is the better reading.

† Contrary, however, to all the ancient

versions, who read אחרי in one word.

‡ Thus Englished by the Douay translators: "For she said: Verily here

"have I seen the backe parts of him that hath seen me."

γενεσιων [μου] ειδον σφραγισα μου. I have added μου in brackets, because I suspect it was originally in Sep. as it is still in the Copt. and in one of Holmes's Arab. mss.

Ver. 14. *Wherefore the well was called The well of the visible God.* Lit. the well of the God of vision. I have here indulged an emendation partly conjectural. The present Text is: באר ראי לדי, which our translators, in the margin, render "The well of him that liveth and seeth me." So the Latin Vulg. "Puteum viventis et videntis me."—The version of Sep. at first sight seems strange: φραση, ον ενωπιον ειδον. They seem to have again read אוראי instead of לדי; and to have understood אלודם God: "The well where I saw God beside me." This is not amiss: but it does not entirely satisfy me. I presume then, that the true reading is באר אלודי ראי *The well of the visible God*: conformable to verse 13.—Cui hæc displiceant, is meliora inveniat.

C H A P. XVII.

Ver. 1. *GOD the omnipotent.* Although I have preferred this appellation; I am not quite sure that it is the real meaning of the Hebrew word שדי: which some derive from the Chald. שדא to *shed*; because God *sheds* his bounties on man: and this is certainly no improper or improbable derivation. The *all-sufficient* of the Arab. version is applicable to both attributes. The derivation of שדי from שדד is highly improbable. The Lord would not assume, at any time, a name that better suits *him* who is called the *destroyer*; much less at a time when he is encouraging his servant to look for his protection and favour. Ikenius, indeed, has endeavoured to shew that שדד, in Arabic at least, signifies, *powerful, strong*: and in this sense it will be synonymous with *omnipotent*.—Michælis thought שדי came from the Arab. سد to *mount up*: and is equivalent to επουρανιος.—It is observable that the word either was not read at all, by Sep. or that they omitted to render it. They have only εγω ειμι ο θεος σου. Is it probable that they read אלהך? The Gr. of Venice has εγω θεος ο κρατατος.

Ver. 13. *Born in thy house, or purchased with thy money.* This distinction of slaves is clearly marked in Sophocles, CEd. Tyr. ver. 1143. ην δουλος. κ. τ. λ.—So our Chaucer: "Thine owne square, and eke thine owne born-man."

Ver. 14. It is rather odd, that the addition in Sep. "on the eighth day" is not found wanting in any one of Holmes's mss. This, with Sam. copy, is much in favour of that reading.

Ver. 15. *Sarai—Sara.* I have said in my explanatory note that *Sarai*, or rather *Sari*, appears to me to signify a *star*. My reasons are, 1. The prior name of *Sara*, namely *Sarai* or *Sari*, was most probably given to her in Syria: now סרי in Syriac signifies a *star*. 2. We learn from the book of Job, chap. 42. ver. 14. that it was usual in the East to give to beautiful women the names of stars. *Sarai* then was the *Astoria* or *Stella* of her day. At least, this is a much more probable etymon, than either the common one, which makes *Sarai* signify *My lady*, a title which, I believe, is unknown among the Orientalists; or Michælis's *colocynth*, which we can hardly suppose could ever be the name of the beautiful *Sara*. With respect to this latter new name I cannot but agree with Ikenius, that it is derived from the Arab. سرام, which denotes *fecundity*. The objection of Michælis to this etymon, from the *eliph*, in Arab., having a *hamza*, is a pitiful objection: there existed no hamzas in the days of Abraham.

Ver. 16. *Whom I will also blest.* וברכתו. So Sam. Sep. and Syr. which I prefer to the present tautological reading ברכתה.

C H A P. XVIII.

Ver. 8. *CREAM*. חמאה. So Rashi explains it. שֶׁן חֶמֶל The fat of the milk. I am not however certain, but it may rather mean that sort of acid milk which the heat coagulates, and which is exceedingly cooling in the summer season. That it was in some degree a potable liquid, is clear from Jud. 5. 25. where Jaël presents it to Siserah, to quench his thirst. Abraham, then, brought to his guests either *cream* and *simple milk*, or *sour* and *sweet milk*: which mixt together, make, even in our climate, a very palatable dish.

Ver. 10. *According to the time of life*. כַּעַת חַיָּה. Sep. κατὰ καιρὸν τούτων εἰς ὥρας. Vulg. Tempore isto, vita comite: and similar guess-work is in all the antient versions. The best of those conjectures appears, to me, that of the Persic זמן וזמן חמור Justa tempus factus. This is, I think, the true meaning. See my explanatory note.

Ver. 19. *For I know*, &c. The present Hebrew has, *I know him*, יָדַעְתִּי, which Houbigant renders *ego providi de eo*; and Michaëlis: "Ich habe ihn zum freunde erwählt;" *I have chosen him for a friend, that he may*, &c. This interpretation is adopted by Schulze and Rosenmüller: *Eum enim amicum elegi, ut præcipiat*, &c. "By this rendering (say they) the affix *vau* is expressed, which it is not by the common translation; and לִמְעַן retains its ordinary and proper "acceptation." The former of these reasonings is weakened by the Sam. lection יָדַעְתִּי, without the affix; which was read by none of the antient versions, save Perf. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven.—There seems to be more force in the latter reasoning, which is chiefly insisted on by Houbigant: "Neque aliam sententiam capit לִמְעַן אֲשֶׁר, in quo adverbio causa est rei futuræ, "non autem nuda ejus expositio." So, indeed, the Erpenian Arab. seems to have understood his Text לֹאן שְׂרַפְתָּהּ בְּסֵבֵב אֱלֹהֵי אֲמֵר: and it must be confessed that the general meaning of לִמְעַן, with or without אֲשֶׁר, is *because, to the end that*; nor have I found a single passage, but the present one, in which it can well be otherwise rendered. The verb יָדַע has certainly a wider signification than merely to *know*. It often signifies to *acknowledge, approve, superintend*: and it may have some such meaning here; especially if the present reading יָדַעְתִּי be accounted the genuine one. But if the other reading, יָדַעְתִּי, which has for it the authority of Sam. Sep. Syr. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. and Arab. Pol. then I think we must give to לִמְעַן אֲשֶׁר an uncommon meaning, and render, with the forementioned translators, as I have done. So Dathe: "Novi enim, "eum præcepturum esse filiis suis et posteris suis, ut instituta mea servant," &c.—For the rest, the word *Abraham*, which I have inserted from Sam. is also, I now find, the reading of 3 mss. of Sep. and was read by Chrysostom in his copy.

Ver. 20, 21. What scholar, on reading these verses, does not immediately call to mind these beautiful lines of Ovid:

Contigerat nostras infamia temporis aures;
Quam cupiens falsam, summo delabor Olympo,
Et Deus, humana lustro sub imagine terras.

C H A P. XIX.

Ver. 11. *THEY smote with such blindness.* דָּבַר בְּטוֹרִים. Sep. ἐκταλαῖαν ἐν σκοτεινίᾳ*. The Hebrew word, which occurs only here, seems to me to be a compound from the Arab. سنا which signifies a *flash*, and of מֵאֵר *light*. The blindness then was caused by a flash † of lightning; and might be only temporary. The Greek version is susceptible of this meaning. The French version of Geneva is not improper: "Ils frapperent d'éblouissement."

Ver. 14. *Who had married his daughters,* לָקַח בָּנוֹתָיו, which is commonly rendered *had betrothed his daughters*. But it is אָרַשׁ, not לָקַח that signifies *to betroth*: and the Sep. have well rendered the latter by τοὺς υἱοθετούς ‡. This relates to other daughters of Lot, than those after mentioned, ver. 15. who are said to be those two only who were then *present* with him.

Ver. 16. *As he still lingered.* וַיִּתְמַחֵם. The Sep. seem to have read some other word; perhaps וַיִּתְמַחֵם from וָמַח, which twice in the Psalms is rendered by the same Greek word which they use here, ἐταραχθησαν § *they were troubled*. Yet in Ps. 119. וַיִּתְמַחֵמֶנּוּ is rendered, as here, ἐταραχθη. Had ταρᾶσσω or ταρᾶσσω ever such a meaning? Or is the Greek word here a corruption? I find no word in the language that could well be mistaken for it; at any rate, the Text and all the other versions have *lingered*, or something equivalent. Lot was loth to leave Sodom, which he had chosen for his residence; and where he had probably made connections.

Ver. 20. What I have rendered "Is it not a small city?" may signify "Is it not a small boon" *which I ask?* But the other seems to be the better translation.

Ver. 24. *When the Lord himself, &c.* Lit. *The Lord, from the Lord, &c.* יְהוָה מִיְהוָה. This Hebraism has been a source of much scholastic disputation. The great bulk of Christian Theologues have imagined that two divine persons are here mentioned. The first *Lord* is Jesus Christ, who was one of the three angels who appeared to Abraham; and is now one of the two who were sent to destroy Sodom and Gomorra; and who rains down from the second *Lord*, that is from his *father*, fire and brimstone on the Sodomites. It is rather astonishing, that even Houbigant and Michaëlis should have gone into this systematical reverie.—This is one bad consequence of servile translations. If the Greek and Latin versions had not literally rendered the original Κυριος, παρὰ Κυριου; *Dominus, a Domino*; we should most probably never have heard of distinction of persons. The Arabic translator seems well to have understood his Text; as he renders וַיִּתְּן מִן עַצְמוֹ וַיִּסַּח מִן הָאֵשׁ וַיִּסַּח מִן הָאֵשׁ *God rained from himself sulphureous flame, &c.*—Nothing is more common in the oriental languages, than to use the *noun* for the *pronoun*: and this indeed seems to be the language of nature. A child is not apt to say of himself, *I am a good boy*; but *Billy good boy*; or of his sister, *Thou art a naughty girl*, but *Sally naughty girl*: and it is with some difficulty that he is made to understand, that *I* means himself, and תָּרוּ the person to whom he speaks. A few examples from Scripture will, I apprehend, settle this matter Gen. 2. 3. "God blessed the seventh day, &c. because on it he ceased from all

* Ald. and 53 mss. want the preposition ἐν which, however, I am persuaded stood originally in Sep. rather by repeated flashes, for the word is in the plural; and rendered by Gr. Ven. ἐν σκοτεινίᾳ.

† Or § Most modern translators, however, follow the Vulgate: *qui accepturi erant*: and so Josephus understood the Text. The other versions are ambiguous.

‡ The only variety of lection, worth remarking, is that of 3 Arab. mss. which read in the singular number.

“his works which *he* (the Text has *God*) had ordained to create.”—Exod. 16. 7. “Ye shall see the glory of the Lord, on his hearing your murmurings against *him*”—the Text has “against *the* Lord.”—Thus Josh. 9. 21. “Let them live, said the chiefs, as the *chiefs* (that is *we*) have promised to them,” &c.—1 Kings 2. 19. “Solomon caused a throne to be placed for the *king's* mother,” that is, for *his own* mother.

I cannot quit the destruction of Sodom, and the deliverance of Lot, without a most apt quotation from Rosenmüller. “Mirum in modum huic nostræ historiæ similis est ea quam Ovidius, lib. 8. Metam. de Philemone et Baucide narrat. Jupiter et Mercurius, ut hinc duo angeli, inter homines humanâ formâ induti, iter faciunt—homines plane inhospitales offendunt, ut inter Sodomitas nulla hospitum reverentia fuit—unus tamen Philemon Diis peregrinantibus, ut Lotus angelis, hospitium præbuit. Tandem Jupiter et Mercurius deos se fatentur, pœnasque vicinis minantur, quod idem hic faciunt duo angeli—Dii Philemonem et Baucin eripiunt periculo, ut angeli Lotum et familiam—Servantur Philemon et Baucis domum relinquendo, atque in montem, præeuntibus Diis, fugiendo; quemadmodum Lotus et filia—Plectuntur, denique, vicini Philemonis et Baucidis, mutato in stagnum eorum oppido; uti vallis Siddim lacus facta est—

———*Tellus habitabilis olim,*

Nunc celebres mergis fulicisque palustribus undæ!

Ver. 26. To what I have said in my explanatory note, I have only to add, that some modern interpreters are of opinion that the *saline statue*, here mentioned, was a monument erected by posterity to the memory of Lot's wife. This appears to me highly improbable. The translation in my note is that of Dathe: “Uxor vero Loti, cum respiceret, in solo saluginoso hæret infixa.” He supposes that a ב may have dropt out of the text, before מלחה, from its contiguity to the ב at the end of נצב.

Verses 31, 32, 33. Mar-Ephræm puts a curious apology in the mouth of Lot's daughters, on their pregnancy being discovered. They very gravely tell him, that the young men of Sodom, to whom they had been betrothed, had found means to get into their apartments, and had violated them, anteriorly to their leaving that city. The good Lot believed them, and was satisfied.

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 16. *LO! I have given, &c.* This has been always considered as a very difficult passage; and I long despaired of making any tolerable sense of it. The present Text runs thus: רָגַעְתִּי מֵאֶלֶף כֶּסֶף לְאֶחָד־חֶנֶּה דָּוָה לְךָ כְּסוּת עֵינַיִם לְכָל אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה וְכָל וְנִכְתָּת: which our translators render, “Behold, I have given thy brother a thousand *pieces* of silver: behold, he is to thee a covering of the eyes, unto all that *are* with thee, and with all *other*: thus she was reproved.” To me this literal version is unintelligible; and is one of the many proofs which can be adduced, that the present Hebrew Text is incapable of being translated into sense, without being first corrected. Now it luckily happens that it is here, in part, corrected

rected by the Sam. exemplar, 'וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה לְאֶחָדָם' וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו' וְלֹכַל אִשְׁרָא אֶתְךָ. This was partly the reading of Sep. who seem well to have understood the first part of the passage, Ἰδοὺ δέδωκα χίλια δίδραγμα * τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου ταῦτα ἐξαι† σοι εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ προσώπου σου, καὶ πᾶσαι αὗται μετὰ σοῦ καὶ πάντα ἀληθεύσου. The whole of this version is clear: only they seem to have refined on the words כָּסָה עֵינָיו, which they render τιμὴν προσώπου *the honour of the face*, i. e. a precious veil. In the last comma they are not so happy: for how out of וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו, which is the Sam. reading, or even out of וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו, which is the Hebrew reading, they could draw καὶ πάντα ἀληθεύσου, I cannot comprehend. They must have read, I think, וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו, which Syr. Vulg. Saad. and even the Thargums, also read; or suppressed the *vau* before כָּסָה. Yet still, how will these words produce either the meaning of Sep. *and tell nothing but truth*; or Jerom's *et quocumque perrexeris, memento te deprehensam*; or the wilder paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan? Houbigant, who often finds corruptions in the Text where they are not, here maintains its integrity. "Nihil mendaci est in voce וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו. Nos, *ne te concupiscant: verbum pro verbo, nam concupiscibilis es, ob tuam pulchritudinem*; ex *נָכַר* Arabico verbo, *ducere uxorem, uti uxore; vel ejus matrimonium ambire*." If poor Le Clerc had ventured such a version, he would have been roughly handled for it by the Oratorian. Indeed it is altogether unworthy of Houbigant.

Michaëlis's version of the whole passage appears to me little less exceptionable. He derives כָּסָה from כָּסָה *numerare*, and renders עֵינָיו כָּסָה *multa oculorum*; the *fine* which Abimelech paid for *looking* at Sara; and takes נָכַר to be the sec. perf. fem. sing. of the active voice of נָכַר, which, he thinks, is well rendered by Sep. ἀληθεύσω. Then the וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו are to be disjoined from what precedes, and united to what follows; and hence will arise the following version: "Lo! I have given to thy brother a thousand shekels of silver, as an eye-fine: but to all *who are with thee, tell all the truth*." I wonder that such a version could be approved by Schulze and Rosenmüller. Michaëlis himself gives a much better one in his German translation: "Ich habe deinem bruder tausend seckel silbers zugestellet, für die kaufe einen ich-leyer, und trage ihn überall, damit jedermann wisse, daß du verkeyrathet bist." So Dathe: "Dedi mille fidos argenteos fratri tuo, pro quibus velamen faciei tuæ emas, ut cum omnes *qui tecum sunt, tum et alii, qui te viderint, intelligant te esse maritum*." This free paraphrase is perfectly intelligible: but I cannot think it the true meaning of the original, which I will now endeavour to give. I follow the reading of the Sam. copy, without the elision of a single letter: I only change the *vau* before נָכַר into a *be*, which, from the great resemblance of the two letters in the antient character, may have by transcribers been readily mistaken for a *vau*. I next borrow from the Arabic the original meaning of נָכַר, which I believe to be *inire*; and וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו *femina inita*: one who is no more a virgin; or a *married person, maritata*. Then I think all will be clear, and the Text, thus divided and pointed, וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו וְלֹכַל אִשְׁרָא אֶתְךָ' וְהָאֵלֹהִים כָּסָה עֵינָיו will give the following

* Compl. and Alex. have δίδραγμα (omitted by Holmes); and one ms. has δίδραγματα.

† One ms. has

ἀγνοῶν, but without σοι. ‡ One of Holmes's uncial mss. has here a singular reading—καὶ μετὰ ψευδὲς το

ἀγνοῶν. § Making *me* the fem. pronoun. ¶ I think this better than throwing out the letter altogether; although that would make no odds as to the signification of the sentence.

literal version: "Ecce dedi mille argenti *feclos* fratri tuo: ecce, hoc *argentum* tibi velaminis "oculorum *sit pretium*; et omni quæ tecum est; omni nempe maritalæ." This, I am persuaded, is the genuine reading, and true meaning of this passage.—*Viderint eruditi.*

C H A P. XXI.

Ver. 14. *A BOTTLE of water.* I have retained the word *bottle*, although, with us, it gives a different idea. The antient bottles were made of skins, and contained more or less, according to the size of the animals (commonly goats) out of whose skins they were made. They are still used in the East for carrying water and wine; and as they are carried on camels, equipoised on each side of the bearer, they are more convenient than any other: "Il vaut mieux avoir le vin et l'eau dans des peaux de chevres, lorsqu'on voyage dans les païs orientaux. Le poil des peaux, qui contiennent l'eau, est en dehors; au lieu que celui des peaux, qui contiennent le vin, est en dedans: et ces peaux sont si bien poissées, que la liqueur ne contracte pas le moindre mauvais goût." Niebuhr, *Voyage en Arabie*, vol. i. p. 171.

Ver. 19. *God opening her eyes*, &c. signifies only, according to the Hebrew phraseology, that she was fortunate enough to discover a well; which is no easy matter in those deserts, where wells are not plenteous, and are often so covered up as that none, but they who are acquainted with the places, can find them out.

Ver. 23. *My posterity.* In the Hebrew are two words, *לני ונכרי*, which are rendered by Sep. *σπέρμα μου* and *ὄνομα μου*, *my seed and my name*. Vulg. *posteris meis stirpique mea*. Syr. *בטרי ונכרי*. Onk. *בבר ובר בר*, *to my son and son's son*: and so equivalently Jonathan. Perf. Arab. Erp. followed by Pagninus, our English translators, Le Clerc, Houbigant, and Dathe. But as the precise meaning of the original words * is not sufficiently ascertained, I have chosen to express them both by the word *posterity*. So Michaëlis: "Mit mir, und meinen nachkommen."

Ver. 27. *Took flocks and herds.* Houbigant here has committed an oversight: he renders, without any authority, *tulit septem agnos et bovem*.

Ver. 31. *Beer-sheba*, *באר שבע*. *Beer* signifies both an *oath* and *seven*. Probably the oath was repeated seven times, according to the number of lambs. We are told by Niebuhr, (*Description de l'Arabie*, p. 176.) that the Iman of Yemen confirmed his promise with *seven oaths*.

Ver. 33. *A tamarisk.* That *אזל*, Arab. *أزلق*, signifies a tamarisk, is clearly shewn by Celsius, Hierobotan. part i. p. 537. See also Michaëlis's *Supplementa ad Lex. Hebr.*

* *נכר* seems to signify a representative. *נ* posterity, *ב* posterity, of any degree. The Greek of Venice has for the last word *σπέρμα*.

C H A P. XXII.

Ver. 2. *THE land of Moria*, * אֶרֶץ הַמֹּרְיָה. Sam. has הַמֹּרְיָה; and this seems to have been the reading of Aquila, Symmachus, Jerom, and even of Sep. although they render it by ὁψηλην, as they had before rendered a similar word, ch. xii. 6. I am therefore inclined to think that this is the genuine reading; whether we consider the word as an *appellative* or a *proper name*. As an appellative, it might be rendered *the land of vision*; or, more properly, *a conspicuous land*, as Aquila renders τῆς γῆς τῆς καταφανῆς. The Syr. interpreter took it to be the *land of the Amorites*. Onkelos, Tharg. Bab.† and both Arabs, render the Hebrew word by words that denote *worship, adoration, service*, עֲבָדָה, פִּלְחָנָה. Most singular is the rendering of Gr. Ven. τῆς γῆς Μορχιαν.—On the whole, I deemed it better, with our vulgar translation, Michaëlis and Dathe, to retain the original word, than to risk a doubtful meaning, at best, and perhaps a false one.

Ver. 13. *He saw beside him a ram*. I have said in my explanatory note, that “perhaps the Sam. Greek, and Syr. reading is the true one.” I write this in the full conviction that it is the true one, or at least a part of the true one; and that the word אֶחָד, in the present Text, is either a corruption or out of its place.—The change from אֶחָד to אֶחָד was easily made. This latter reading, however, must have been in Jerom’s copy, and in that of the Perfic translator. But all the rest, ‡ from Sep. down to the Greek of Venice, read אֶחָד; and this is still the reading of forty-two Hebrew mss. of a very old edition without date, and of the ed. of Lisbon 1491, which, De Rossi observes, is very accurate, and rarely departs from the Masoretic readings. It is observable that Onk. and Saadiah seem to have had both lections in their Text, as the former has אֶחָד אֶחָד after אֶחָד; as if he had read אֶחָד after אֶחָד, and אֶחָד, where אֶחָד now stands, after אֶחָד. So Saadiah has אֶחָד אֶחָד in the same place and meaning.—If אֶחָד was ever in the Text, I would place it after אֶחָד and write, not אֶחָד, but אֶחָד *beside him*. In this supposition I have expressed, in my translation, the meaning of both words; for *a* before *ram* is equivalent to *one*. I might have rendered אֶחָד אֶחָד, more properly perhaps, *a single ram*; prevented from following the flock, by being entangled in *a thicket* of brambles, or some such shrub.

Ver. 14. *And Abraham called the name of that place JEVE-IRAE*, יְהוֹוֵה יִרְאֶה, which the Masoretes point thus יְהוֹוֵה יִרְאֶה, in our common translation *Jehovah-Irah*. This is of little importance: But how are the words to be rendered? The Septuagint have Κυριος εἰδεν, (one ms. εἰδεν): the Latin Vulgate, *Dominus videt*: Syr. אֵלֵהּ יִרְאֶה *the Lord will provide*; or, as we sometimes say, *see to it*; and this, I doubt not, is the true meaning. The phrase evidently alludes to the answer of Abraham, ver. 8. “God will provide for himself a victim,” &c. It was so understood

* One of Kenn. mss. has הַמֹּרְיָה, and the Perfic translator must have read the word with a *vau*, as he has retained the very name so spelled.

† Tharg. Jerus. has מִשְׁכַּן מֹרְיָה on Mount Moria: and some modern interpreters are of opinion that Mount Moria, on which Solomon’s Temple was built, is here proleptically to be understood. ‡ The word, indeed, is not expressed in either of the Arabs, probably because they deemed it an expletive: but it is fully expressed by Sep. and Gr. Ven. αἰς. Syr. and Jon. וְיִרְאֶה. Onk. וְיִרְאֶה. It is worth remarking, as corroborative of the Sam. reading, that there is a similar expression in Daniel viii. 3. “I raised mine eyes; when lo! I saw, standing by the river, *a ram*, אֶחָד אֶחָד.”

by Arab. Exp. who renders אללה יסר; and still better by Gr. Ven. Ὁ Οὐρανὸς οὐρανός *. It is strange that the Septuagint, who, in the verse just mentioned, had used the same word οὐρανός, should have here used εὐρ and still more strange that, in the last colon of ver. 15. they should have rendered the same word passively ὁφθαλμοῖς. Yet in this they have been followed by Pagninus and most modern translators, *In monte Dominus videbitur*. Some, among whom our last translators, put the word סר in construction, and render, "In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." What meaning they annexed to such a sentence I am at a loss to know. Delgado tried to mend it thus: "*Concerning which place it will some day be said, In the mountain of the Lord, the Lord shall appear* †." Houbigant seems to have been guided by a somewhat similar fancy. He imagines, that God here shewed to Abraham his son Jesus Christ, who was to be the future victim for the world: "and this is what Abraham consecrates to eternal memory, when he subjoins, *To-day in the mountain the Lord shall be seen: Hodie in monte Dominus videbitur*: illud hodie sic accipiens, ut accipit Paulus apostolus illud Davidis, *Hodie si vocem ejus audieritis*: quod hodie tamdiu durat, quamdiu sæcula illa durabunt, de quibus apostolus, *donec hodie cognominatur*. Propterea, Abraham non dicit, *Hodie Dominus videtur*. Nam id spectaculum nunc solus videt Abraham, postea omnes visuri sunt, et ad omnes pertinebit istud *videbitur*, generatim dictum, cum omnes unigenitum in monte viderint generis humani victimam factam. Nec aliam sententiam series verborum patitur. Ex qua serie illi deviant, qui hæc verba מֹשֶׁה יִסֵּר מֹשֶׁה Mosi sic narranti attribuunt; quasi renarret Moses usurpatum sua ætate proverbium. Nam, si sic erit, non jam docebit Abraham, cur huic loco nomen fecerit, *Dominus videbitur*, quam tamen nominum notationem in sacris paginis non omittunt ii, quicunque nomina rebus imponunt. Quod contra planè docebit Abraham, si de eo Moses sic narrat, *Vocavit nomen loci hujus, Deus videbitur: nam dixit, In monte Deus videbitur*."—I have given the whole passage in the words of the author, for the purpose of exhibiting one of the first biblical critics of the present age, supporting an insupportable version by a tissue of as bad reasoning as I have ever met with. He would have here done well to pay some attention to Le Clerc, who has very properly rendered the first comma, although he mistook the meaning of the second; which is justly rendered by Jerom ‡, Gr. Ven. §, and our translator Coverdale: "Upon the mountain shall [will] the Lord provide." For in this I agree with Houbigant that, in both commas, יסר should be pointed and rendered in the same manner; that is, not in the future passive, but in the future active.—I will just mention Dr. Kennicott's translation, for

* So also the Perfic translator. Onkelos, Jonathan and Saadiah have here wild conjectural paraphrases. How Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion rendered, we know not. † "It most likely refers (says he) to the Sche-

binah in the holy temple upon mount Zion, which is this very mountain. The word יסר means some day. See Job 1. 6. 13. and 2. 1. It can never mean, as the English translator renders it, *as it is said to this day*; for this was not said until David's time: so that we are not obliged to allow that an interpolation was made, in David's time, of these words, as Aben Ezra pretends." This is a rare way of getting rid of an interpolation. But, in truth, there is no necessity to say with Aben Ezra, that there is here any interpolation. It may be a part of the original narrative, whether written by Moses or any other person; or at any time posterior to the transaction recorded. An expression may become proverbial during the life-time, even, of him who first uttered it: but that is not a proof of the narrator's having lived soon after, or long after, that period. All that we can lawfully infer from the Text is, that these words, *In the mountain the Lord will provide*, had become a proverbial saying when the author wrote. ‡ *In monte Dominus videbitur*. § *Ex opes ὁ οὐρανὸς οὐρανός*.

the sake of Secker's note on it. " Kennicott (says he) translates: *Because he had said, that day, On the mountain the Lord will provide*: but, then, I think it should have been אִשָּׁר, (not אִשָּׁר;) and I doubt whether דוֹם דוֹם singly do not always signify *this day*. The comma might be translated thus: *which is said at this day: On the mountain, &c.* or, *as it is said*: " for אִשָּׁר is sometimes put for כִּאֲשֶׁר. יִרְאֶה might be passive; but אֱלֹדִים יִרְאֶה, ver. 8. directs " to the other sense."

C H A P. XXIII.

Ver. 1. I HAVE said, in my Explan. Note, that the parenthesis שָׁנֵי דַי שָׁדָה *for so many years did Sara live*, is in all the ancient versions save Sep. and Vulg. I now find it is in 2 of Holmes's mss. one of which is in uncial letters. Still I am inclined to deem it an interpolation; or, perhaps, originally a marginal notice, which afterwards crept into the Text.

Ver. 2. The addition in Sam. and Sep. (*in the valley*) is marked with an obelos in one of Holmes's uncial mss.; and Jerom, Quæst. Hebr. says, " Hoc quod hic positum est, quæ est in " valle, in authenticis codicibus non habetur *."

Ver. 10. *Ephron, who was then sitting, &c.* So the late Bp. Law in his manuscript notes, and Ainsworth and Purver in their versions: and so, long before them, Sep. אַחֲרָיו and indeed, equivalently, all the ancient versions, save Vulg. which has *habitabat, dwelt*; followed by James's translators, and retained by Bate.

C H A P. XXIV.

Ver. 4. *BUT that thou wilt go to my own country, &c.* כִּי אֶל אֶרֶץ. The Jewish interpreters tell us that כִּי is here for כִּי. But the Sam. copy and more than twenty mss. have כִּי אֶרֶץ, which, undoubtedly, is the true reading.

Ver. 9. *Under the thigh of his master Abraham.* תַּחַת יָד אֲבִרָם אֲדָמִי, where, according to some critics, אֲדָמִי is in the plural. I think not; but believe it to be in the singular, with the affix; as אֲדָמִי is often used; as if we were to say, *his my-lord; his my-father*.

Ver. 22. *A golden pendant.* נָזֶם דָּהָב. I have not translated נָזֶם by *ear-ring* or *nose-ring*, but rather by a more generical term which may suit both. And, indeed, I believe it to have been rather a jewel hanging by the nose, than in the nose. Hence it was well rendered by Symmachus *ερεπιδωμεν*, as we learn from Jerom †, who adds, that although the other interpreters rendered it by *inaurem*, yet by that word is not meant ear-rings, properly so called, but circular pendants made in the form of ear-rings. " Non quò in aures ponantur in naribus, quæ ex eo " quod de auribus pendeant innaures vocantur: sed quò circulus in similitudinem factus in- " aurium, eodem vocabulo nuncupetur: et usque hodie inter cætera ornamenta mulierum, " solent aurei circuli in os ex fronte pendere, et imminere naribus." At this day the women

* Houbigant wrongly asserts, that the Complutensian edition has not the words in question. It has the very same reading as the other editions; *ἡ δὲ Σαρα ἐγενήθη ἑκατὸν ἑπτὰ ἔτη*. So also the Coptic version, and the Lat. Italic, in Aulim: and, indeed, I am much inclined to think that it was originally in the Hebrew Text; especially as it is still in the Samaritan copies.

† In Ezek. 16. 12. tom. iii. p. 790, ed. Ben.

of Arabia wear such pendants *. It is true that some women, particularly in Persia, wore rings in their noses, which for that purpose they pierced with a needle, as the curious reader may see in *Thevenot, Arviand, Michah, Pietro de la Valle, Russel's Aleppo*, &c. Still I thought it better here to use a more general term, which might suit either, *face*, or *nose*, or *ear*.

Ver. 26. *The man fell down.* This, I now think, is not a just rendering. The common version, *he bowed down his head*, or rather, *he bowed his head*, seems better to express the meaning of פָּרַח; although by some of the ancient translators it was considered as equivalent to our *prostrate*. In my explanatory note, I have observed that the Septuagint seem to have read a different word, as they render ἀδοκμας †. I am now of opinion that they read as we do, but gave to the word a transitive meaning; and that their ἀδοκμας should be rendered, not *blissing*, but *being well pleased* ‡, which Abraham's servant shewed by an inclination of his head: as we say, *to nod assent, approbation, complacency*.

Ver. 30. The transposition of the words *Haran*, &c. is thus defended by Houbigant: "Hæc verba in versum rejicimus sequentem, eò quod hæc sequuntur *accidit autem, cum videret*, &c. quæ videre non potuit Laban, si jam foras exierat. Neque licet credere, Laban foras antea exiisse, quàm sorore ex sua didicisset ea, quæ versu 30. narrantur. Atque cum narrandi ordinem esse præposterum, docet illud פָּרַח, quod rerum seriem solet indicare in narrando talem, qualis fuit ipse ordo rerum gestarum."—Delgado has endeavoured to reconcile the present arrangement by rendering the verbs in the preter-perfect tense. "When he *had seen*—and *had heard*," &c. And so Dathe, *cum audisset*—et *vidisset*. But still this is awkward in English; and all is made clear by the transposition.

Ver. 32. *He brought the man*, &c. I have followed the reading of the Vulgate, which arises from a different pronounciation of the word בָּרַח, which is here, I think with Dathe, in the *co-actives* voice. The other rendering, although that of almost all the versions, is not near so natural, nor so agreeable to the context. It may, however, be defended on this principle, that the Hebrew writers are not always so accurate in their connection of the various parts of a sentence, as that each verb has the same nominative.

Ver. 50. *Laban and Bethuel answered.* This is the first time that Bethuel is introduced. All had hitherto been transacted by Laban. Hence some have imagined that Bethuel, who is supposed to have been dead, is here an interpolation. I see no reason for such a supposition. He might be old and infirm, and consequently unable to perform himself the offices of hospitality, which he left to his more able and active son. His consent, however, was here necessary; and he is accordingly brought on the scene.—For the rest, it is well known that, in those countries, the brothers were at least as much the guardians of their unmarried sisters, as the father. See Michaëlis's *Mosaisches Recht*, part ii. sect. 83.

Ver. 55. *A year or ten months.* In the present Text, there is only עשר אֶחָד, *dies aut decem*, which makes no tolerable sense; although our English translators, by the aid of

* "Les femmes Arabes (says La Roque) portent une gaze brodée de sequins et d'autres pieces de monnoye d'or, qui pendent autour du front, et de deux cotés des joues." *Voyage dans la Palestine*, p. 219. See also p. 225.

† There is no variety of lection in Holmes's mss. save that the Slavonic of Moscow is supposed to have read αδομας. Theodoret has οσμεμας in a quotation which he makes in his books *on Providence*, vol. iv. p. 608, nov. ed.

‡ The Latin translation in Pol. Complut. is *complacens*; better than the *benedicens* in the London Polyglott.

an Italic eke, and straining the word עשר, have made out the following version: "Abide with us a few days, at the least ten." More literally, Coverdale: "Abide at the least ten days," from the Vulgate, *saltem decem dies*, and Sep. *ἡμέρας ὥσπερ δέκα*. But, besides that אין no where else signifies either *saltem* or *ὥσπερ*, it is here placed in a situation that cannot admit such a rendering.—The Sam. copy has evidently a better reading, ימים או חדש *days*, (i. e. a whole year,) or a month. Yet the leap from a year to a month is so great that one is apt to suspect this reading also. Houbigant would retain the חדש of Sam. but place it before ימים, a month of days, that is, a complete month, as the same words are to be taken ch. 29. 14.; and it must be allowed that this is a most ingenious conjecture*; but as עשר, or עשר, is in all the Hebrew copies, and was read by all the antient translators, save Syr. I would rather say that the word חדש had been dropped out of the Hebrew Text, than that עשר had been soisted into it. From both Texts, then, we have perhaps the genuine lection, ימים או עשר חדש a year or ten months. Onkelos, Jonathan, and both Arabs. must have so read in their copies †. Both Dathe and Michaëlis have adopted this reading: *Annus, aut decem menses—Ein iahr, oder zehn monath.*

Ver. 60. *Mayst thou multiply into many thousands.* ודי לאלף רבבה. *Sis in millia multa.* Sep. *γὰρ εἰς χιλιάδας † μυριάδων.* Vulg. *crescas in mille millia.* And so most of the other antient versions, making רבבה some definite number. I think it means any very great indeterminate number, and have rendered it accordingly §.

Ver. 62. *Isaac had come from Beer-elohi-rui.* The present Hebr. Text runs thus: ויצאק בא מצוק רוא, which in our common version is rendered, "And Isaac came from the way of the well Lahai-roi."—The phrase בא מצוק *be had come from coming*, is an uncouth and uncommon expression. It is defended, however, by Aben-Ezra, Le Clerc, and others, who think it similar to the French *il venoit d'arriver*. Houbigant laughs at this explanation, not without some appearance of reason: yet most of the antient interpreters seem so to have read in their copies. Sep. alone follows the reading of Sam. במדבר בא *διὰ τοῦ ἐρημου*, *be was walking by*, or *in the desert*, &c. If מדבר were at all originally in the Text, I would say, that the prefix מ had been changed into ב; and that במדבר is the genuine lection. I am, however, more inclined to adopt Houbigant's correction; namely, that מצוק was originally מצוק ||; or to read, with one of Kennicott's mss. במא without בא. Isaac dwelled at Beer-elohi-rui; but went to meet his bride at Hebron, where his father resided, and where his mother had died.

Ver. 63. *To muse.* וישל. Sep. *ἀδελανχῆσαι*, Vulg. *ad meditandum*. Onk. Tharg. Arab. Pers. have words that denote *to pray*; and even the Gr. of Venice has *προσευχῆσθαι*. The Syriac

* And seems to have been the reading which the Syr. translator had before him. † Even the Greek of Venice has *ἡμέρας καὶ δεκαήμερον*: which is a proof that the translator either read חדש in his Hebrew copy, or understood it. Arab. Exp. who is a very literal translator, must have so read in his copy, for he has expressly עשרה שנים. סנה או עשרה שנים.

‡ Three mss. have *χίλιας*. § Archbishop Secker remarks, in his manuscript notes, that when our translators make רבבה a determinate number, they elsewhere render it 10,000; but here, and Ezek. 16. 7. a million.

|| Twenty-five mss. with Compl. and Alex. have *ἐρημικόν*. ¶ This conjecture receives some authority from a ms. which has מצוק: for how could the copyist have thought of inserting עק, if it had not been in his exemplar? De Rossi has no various reading: but his collation is only a partial one; and some of his mss. may possibly have some variation.

version has לַמַּלְכוּת *to walk*: and this by some modern critics is supposed to be the true meaning of the Hebrew word. I see no reason to depart from the commonly received opinion. Schul-tens's derivation to me appears forced and unnatural. But the reader may see him on Job 10. 1. and on Prov. 6. 22.

C H A P. XXV.

Ver. 8. *Full of days.* שבע ימים. The word ימים is not in the present Hebrew Text: but 5 or 6 mss. with Sam. and almost all the antient versions, have it, and it evidently is a part of the Text. It is indeed wanting in the Chaldee of Onkelos in the London Polyglott, which has only שבע; but the Complutenian edition, that of Venice 1590, and several mss, have שבע ימים. Arab. Erp. has only سبع *, and Gr. Ven. has only ακορημενος.

Ver. 16. *Castles.* טירות. Some modern critics imagine that these castles were moveable cottages, *mapalia*. So Faber, Dathe, Schulze: but Michaëlis *schlöffern*. I still think this is the true meaning: they were fastnesses or strong holds for self-defence against sudden attacks: and טיר has never the meaning of a *cottage* either fixt or moveable.

Ver. 21. I have said in my explanatory note, that some critics think that the word which I have rendered *for* לנכח, denotes rather the *time* of praying, than either the *cause* or *place* of praying. So Houbigant: "Orat Isaac coram uxore sua, i. e. cum ea innox congressurus." This meaning is strongly supported by the Arabic signification of נכח, *inire fœminam*. In other places of Hebrew scripture it generally signifies *over against*: and so it is here rendered by Onkelos and most of the oriental translators; although their versions have *pro*. But Sep. Syr. Vulg. and Gr. Ven. have respectively *παρ*, *בצל*, *pro*, *ὑπερ*, which I, with Dathe, have followed in my translation.

Ver. 27. *Who lived at home.* ישב אהלים. Sep. *οικων οικων* †. The word *אהל* signifies not only a *tent*, but any sort of *house* or *home*. Some think that by the words *ישב אהלים* is meant only that *he led the life of a shepherd*. So Dathe, *vitam pastoritiam præferebat*: and Michaëlis, *erwâlte das birtenleben in gezelten*. I think they mean nothing more than that he lived at home with his parents.

C H A P. XXVI.

Ver. 12. *AN hundred returns.* כמה שער. The word *שער* has various meanings; but perhaps all reducible to one root. Here it seems to denote a species of *barley*, of a blackish colour, which, as we learn from Niebuhr, is very prolific. Sep. and Theod. *κηρυνη*, Syr. *סער*. The rest seem to have considered *שער* in its Chaldee meaning, *estimation, reckoning*. I have preferred the word *returns*: that is, *an hundred for one*; whether barley, or any other bearded grain; for this is certainly the meaning. Vulg. *centuplum*.

Ver. 33. *The swearing well.* שבעה. Sep. *επακος*. But Aquila and Synmachus *ωλησημοση*. Vulg. *abundantia*: and this meaning is by some moderns preferred to the other. Singular is Gr. Ven. which renders *ἐπτα seven*: and, again, calls the city *φραρ ἑβδομα*.

* De Rossi says, the addition is also wanting in the Constantinopolitan edition of Saadias: which edition I have not the good fortune to possess.
† Two mss. the Aldine edition and Cyril. AL. have *οικων εν οικω*.

C H A P. XXVII.

Ver. 38. *PENETRATED with sorrow.* κατασχευόμενος. I have said in my Note, that it is not probable that the Greek translators * added this of themselves: I have therefore given it a place in my version: but I have, for the sake of perspicuity, arranged my Text in a somewhat different manner, as the learned reader will readily perceive.

Ver. 39. *Remote, &c.* The Hebrew words are, מְסָכִי הָאָרֶץ יְדִידָה מְשֻׁבֵּן' וּמִטְלֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם מֵעַל, which have been interpreted in two very different manners and opposite meanings. All the antient interpreters, and all our English translators, save Purver, render the prefix מֵעַל by *of*, or some equivalent term: as if Isaac had promised to Esau a fat fertile soil fed by the dews of the heavens. And so even Dathe: "Fertilem terram habitabis, e cælo largè roratum." And Michaëlis: "Fett an boden wird deine wohnung feyn, und von oben herab vom himmel beth-auet." Notwithstanding all this mass of authority, I am clearly of opinion, that the version of Castalio, Le Clerc, Houbigant, &c. is the true one; and that מֵעַל here is a privative preposition, as it is in several other places †, and ought to be rendered by *absque, without*. Indeed without this there would be no contrast between the benediction of Esau and that of Jacob. Nor was Idumæa, or Edom, a fat fertile soil. On the contrary, Malachi tells us that God had made it a fit residence for the dragons of the desert ‡. See the explanatory note.—I will only add, that the Greek version itself admits this explanation: for απο is often equivalent to *ab*, or even *procul a*, remote from: as απο της πατρίδος—απ' ελπίδος, *procul a patria—fine spe.*

Ver. 40. *On thy desert thou shalt live.* עַל חֶרֶבְךָ תֵּחִיָּה. I have, in this instance, departed from all the versions antient and modern. They all render עַל חֶרֶבְךָ by *thy sword*. Yet I cannot think that חֶרֶב here means a sword. If it did, the construction would have been בְּחֶרֶבְךָ, not עַל חֶרֶבְךָ: at least, I can find no other example of עַל having that meaning. Isaac had told him before that he was to inhabit a dry barren soil; he now bids him be content with his portion, and live on the desert allotted to him, until the time come when he shall be able to throw off the yoke of his brother; that is, of his brother's posterity.

Ver. 42. *Hath resolved.* מְתַנַּחֵם. Sep. απειλάει. Vulg. minatur, threatens, which Dathe follows. I rather think the meaning of the word is a gloomy resolution of mind, which consoles itself with the hope of vengeance, manet alta mente repostum. It is well rendered in the Greek of Venice, παραμυθίζεται.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Ver. 13. *STANDING by him,* נֹצֵב עִלָּיו, which is generally rendered *standing on it*, i. e. on the ladder. So Sep. επεστηκει εν' αλτης. and Vulg. innixum scala: and so equivalently almost all modern versions. Yet I am persuaded that this is not the meaning; and that עִלָּיו should here be rendered, not *super eam*, but *juxta eam*. Saadias so, certainly, understood it וְנֹצֵב עִלָּיו; and so, I think, the Syr. Onkelos, and the Targum of Jonathan §, ought to be rendered. It

* I suppose they read in their copy מְשֻׁבֵּן, which, in Gen. 34. 7. is rendered by the same Greek verb. † See Noldius. ‡ Malach. 1. 3. § This last is therefore, in my opinion, rightly translated, in the Polyglott, *juxta eam*: the two former wrong, *super eam*.

is not probable that Jacob saw the apparition at the ladder's top, which, we are told, reached the heavens; but standing by him על at the foot of the ladder. Wherever a word, or phrase, is susceptible of a double or multiple meaning, that is always to be preferred which is most natural and analogous.

Ver. 19. *Ulam-luz.* אֱלָם לֹז. With Sep. †, Capellus, and Houbigant, I take אֱלָם to be a part of the name of the place. Others make it an adverb, and render *utique, certe*; our vulgar version *but*. But this last word is sufficiently expressed by the prefix ו; and if the word אֱלָם be here considered as an adverb, it is visibly an useless pleonasm ‡.

Ver. 21. *And thou be a God to me.* I make this a part of the conditions; not of the consequent vow: and in this sense it seems to have been understood by all the antient translators, save Syr. Vulg. and Perf. who took the prefix *vau* in the sense of *tum, then*, and make it a part of Jacob's vow. So our English translators: "Then shall the Lord be my God:" a version which Delgado justly blames, and well rectifies. Yet Dathe so translates *semper cum ut Deum meum colam.* Not so Michaëlis, nor Schulze, nor Rosenmüller, who all understand it as a part of the conditions §. "Ad protafin pertinet; sequitur apudofis."

CHAP. XXIX.

Ver. 2. *DROVES.* רְעִים. Some modern critics would read רְעִים *shepherds*: and I once thought that a plausible emendation. But I see, now, no necessity for rejecting the present reading. Delgado's observation on the word is apt and judicious.

Ver. 21. *My time is completed.* כִּי מָלֵא יִשְׁ. These words are supposed, by some moderns, to mean only that Jacob was a full-grown man. "Hæc verba (says Rosenmüller) non ad completum *servitutis* tempus, sed ad maturitatem *ætatis* Jacobi pertinent. Petit sibi Rahelam, quia jam ad ætatem plus satis justam pervenerit." So Michaëlis: "Ich bin schon bey vollen Jahren."—I cannot believe that the Hebrew words will bear this meaning; which has been thought of only to reconcile the chronology of the history of Jacob and his sons. Dathe follows the common rendering: "Quod tempus constitutum esset completum."

Ver. 32. *And given me a son.* This addition I have inserted on the sole authority of Sep. and the old Coptic version. It is wanting, however, in Compl. and Alex. and in 8 mss.

CHAP. XXX.

Ver. 8. *WITH great rivalry, &c.* נִפְתָּלִי אֶלְדָּם נִפְתָּלִי עִם אָחִיו. This is variously rendered by the antient interpreters. Sep. συναγλαστο || μου ὁ Θεός και συναγλαστον τη αδελφη μου. Vulg.

* The Sam. Text has אֶל אֱלָם; but not in one word, as Rosenmüller asserts. He was deceived by the Latin version in the Polyglott. † Ουλαμλουζ. So Ald. Vat. with Copt.—Nineteen of Holmes's mss. have Ουλαμματος and Cod. Alex.

with Austin, have Ουλαμματος all manifest corruptions. ‡ The common meaning of אֱלָם is a *court* or *vestibule*. Here it seems to denote some *suburb*, or *out-port*, belonging to *Luz* or *Luxa*. Perhaps it was so understood by *Aquila*, whose true reading is, with great probability, supposed by Scharfenberg to have been *προθυρον*. See his *Animadversiones*, p. 28. § So before them Houbigant: *et fuerit mihi Dominus in Deum.* || Sixteen mss. with Compl.

and Ald. have συναγλαστο, and two mss. with Alex. have συναγλαστο. One ms. has ανταγλαστο. Perhaps ανταγλαστο is the primitive reading—*Aquila*, συναγλαστον με ὁ Θεός, και συναγλαστον.

comparavit

comparavit me Deus cum sorore mea. Both took אֱלֹהִים for a nominative; but how, out of the present words, they could make either of these meanings, is to me incomprehensible. Onkelos likewise makes *God* the nominative; but wildly paraphrases thus: "The Lord hath granted my request, on my supplication: in my prayer I desired to have a son, as well as my sister, and the boon has been granted me." On the other hand, Jonathan makes *Rabel* the nominative, but paraphrases still more loosely than Onkelos. The Syr. translator has rendered only the three last words, and rightly rendered them: "I have contended with my sister." Saadias: "Commiseration from God I have obtained," &c. Arab. Exp. رَعَبَا أَلَهُ رَعَبِيَّةً مَعَ أُخْتِي. Gr. Ven. ἀντιστοιχίαν Θεοῦ ἀντιστοιχίαν ἔχω τῇ μου ἀδελφῇ. These two last have, at least, endeavoured to give a literal version of the original; to which let us now return.

The radical meaning of the word פָּתַל is *tortuousness, writhing, wattle*, twisting, &c.* Hence, in Niphal, it signifies *to be writhed*, that is, *to struggle*†; for, in struggling, the body is writhed, and the limbs entwined with those of the antagonist. This, then, is the literal meaning of נִפְתַּל: but as the strugglings of Rabel were only metaphorical strugglings or emulations, I have preferred the words *rival* and *rivalry*.

Ver. 9. The addition in this verse is from the Rom. and Alex. editions of the Septuagint. It is wanting in Ald. Compl. and 13 of Holmes's mss.; but it is found in 15 mss. and in the Copt. and some other versions made from Sep. I have no doubt of its having been originally in the Text.

Ver. 11. *In luck, or luckily.* Whether we read בָּנָךְ with the printed Hebrew Text and all the Sam. copies, or בָּנָא with 8 mss. and the *Keri*, we must not give to בָּנָא the meaning of our common version, *a troop*. It signifies both here, and in Isa. 65. 11. *good fortune*, which was considered as a species of divinity; and from which our term *God* is derived. All the antient versions concur in rendering בָּנָא here by a word equivalent to *good luck*. Sep. בָּנָא †. Vulg: *feliciter*. Both read בָּנָךְ with the present Text. The others seem to have read בָּנָא; but still בָּנָא is rendered *luck*, or something equivalent. Thus Syr. אַחַת בָּנָא. Onk. אַחַת בָּנָא. Jon. אַחַת בָּנָא. Saad. אַחַת בָּנָא. Arab. Exp. בָּנָא. Perf. בָּנָא. The Greek of Venice alone has καὶ σπουδαίᾳ. The argument urged in favour of this rendering, from Jacob's allusion in the benediction of his children, is frivolous. It is well known that the Hebrews played upon the same word differently, on different occasions. Jacob's allusion to *a troop* would, in the mouth of Lea, have been ridiculous: whereas nothing could be more natural than the expression she uses; and which she repeats, in other terms, in the very next verse. Our best modern critics have rendered as I have done: Houbigant, *feliciter*. Dathe, *fortunâ favente*. Michaëlis, *cum guten gluck*.

Ver. 20. *With a good endowment bath the Lord endowed me.* וְבָרַךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־וְבָרַךְ. The words וְבָרַךְ and וְבָרַךְ no where else occur. Hence they have been variously rendered. In Arabic, وَبَر,

* Our words *wattle* and *wattling* are, I doubt not, derived from it.

† So the Latin deponent *ludor*; which, by the bye, is construed in the same manner as our Hebrew verb *ludor cum*; the root of which, I have no doubt, is the Arabic لَدَّ, to *twist, writh*, &c.

‡ So Ald. Vat. and Alex.; but Compl. and 23 mss. have *στυχεύω* I am lucky. If this were the genuine reading of Sep. I should suppose that they read in their Hebrew copy בָּנָא, as we still read בָּנָא in the next verse: and the Syr. reading בָּנָא seems to strengthen this conjecture.

§ The Jerusalem copy has

has, with other significations, that of a *gift*: and in this sense it was understood by Sep. *Δεδοται* ο Θεος μοι * *δωρον καλον*. So Vulg. *Dedit me Deus dote bona*. And so equivalently all the antient versions, even Gr. of Venice, which has *αγαθητης*—*χαρητης*. I see no reason to seek a new meaning. Schultens's translation, *Utrum* (i. e. *uterum*) *mibi meum optima agitavit Deus agitatione*, a metaphor borrowed from churning butter, is highly ridiculous. See Michaëlis's *Supplementa*.

lb. *will delight in me*. יוֹבֵלִי. This word, which with Sep. I render *will delight in me*, is commonly rendered *will dwell with me*: but then it should have been יוֹבֵל עִמִּי, for which indeed some grammarians pretend it here stands. All the antient versions, however, save Sep. and Syr. give the idea of *habitation*: and the word in some other places seems hardly to admit another meaning. But still that meaning to me appears a forced one here: for did not Jacob *dwell with her* already?—I therefore think the radical meaning is to be sought in the Chald. and Syr. dialects, the latter of which Lea most probably spoke. Now in both these dialects יוֹבֵל signifies *to dung* a field; and thence, to *cultivate*. I see not why this, in a tralatitious sense, may not be the meaning here. "My husband will now *carefs* me more and more; will consider me as a fruitful field, and cultivate me with assiduity." The allusion, in our language is not very delicate: but this is no reason why it should be so in the Hebrew. To be *kind to a field* is, among farmers, equivalent to *manure it well*: and we have no scruple in saying, metaphorically, of a prolific wife, that she is a *well-cultivated, fertile soil* †.

lb. *Zebulun*. His name is supposed, by some critics, to allude to both יוֹבֵל and יוֹדֵד. I am inclined to think it has no relation to the latter word.

Ver. 32. *Let me pass*. אָעָבֵר. So all the copies and antient versions, save Sep. and Vulg. which have *παρελθτω*—*gyra* ‡: as if the former had read יַעֲבֹר, and the latter עָבֵר.

lb. *Remove*. הָסֵר, or rather הָסִיר, as Sam. which Pagninus renders *movendo*: but Sep. and Vulg. imperatively *διαχωρισον*—*separa*. And so even the Greek of Venice, *αφαις*. The rest seem to have read הָסִיר in the first person; and this appears to be the more natural reading.

lb. *The grizzled*. חֹסֶה, commonly rendered *black* §; by our public version *brown*; which is more agreeable to the etymon of the Hebrew word. I prefer *grizzled* for two reasons: First, because I doubt if there be any sheep of a brown colour. Secondly, because the Syr. translator, who must have been well acquainted with sheep of that country, renders בְּחֹרְתָא *black mingled with white*. This is indeed an uncommon colour; and hence the bargain was the more specious on the part of Jacob: whereas black sheep are common enough; and perhaps made a very considerable part of Laban's flock ||.

* Compl. with 18 mss. have μοι ὁ Θεός. Note: The Compl. and Rom. editions are here wrongly pointed. The point should be after καλόν, as it is in Ald. Alex. and 3 mss. † The Greeks, in a similar sense, used ἀρουρα: and the Latin *arvum genitale*.

‡ This, however, is not of Jerom, who, in Q. Hebr. thus renders, *Transibo*, &c. § So Pagninus, Hoobigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, and most of our English versions; and so Onkelos, Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. and perhaps the Arab. Pol. הָסִיר ought so to be understood, although his Latin translator renders it by *versicolor*. Sep. has φαιον, and Vulg. *furvum*.

|| In a manuscript Account of Lisbon I have read the following words: "I saw (in the grounds about the city) on one side a flock of sheep, all white: on the other, at a very small distance, another flock, all black: this last kind are extremely common here; and I am told it is of their wool that Saragossa cloth is made."

With respect to the Text itself, there is visibly much confusion in it; as Jerom long ago remarked: "Multum apud Septuaginta Interpretes confusus est sensus; et, usque in præsentem diem, nullum potui invenire nostrorum, qui, ad liquidum, quid in hoc loco diceretur, exponeret." He then gives his own interpretation, which is very just, although it is not a literal version of the present Text. "Wouldst thou have me serve thee, says Jacob, seven years more? Grant me this request: Separate all the parti-coloured and variegated both of the sheep and goats, and deliver them to thine own sons to keep apart. Then to me give the keeping of all the black and white; and let such as shall henceforth be variegated among them, be mine. My request is not a hard one: the nature of flocks is on your side: for white commonly produce white young ones, and black produce black." Q. Hebr.—This, I think, is the genuine meaning: but still the Text is imperfect; and should, in my conception, be thus restored: הָסִיר מִשֶּׁם כָּל שֶׂה נֶקֶד וְשֵׁלֹא בְּעִיִּים וְכָל שֶׂה חֹם בְּכֻשִּׁיִּים וְשֵׁלֹא תִקְוֹר בְּעִיִּים וְחֹם בְּכֻשִּׁיִּים יִהְיֶה שֶׁנִּרְי The addition of בְּעִיִּים after וְשֵׁלֹא is in one of Kennicott's mss. 173*. The second addition, preceding the concluding comma, is a conjectural emendation, which, in my version, I have expressed in Italics.—We must either admit, I think, this emendation, or with Sept. throw out the first comma altogether, and render thus: "Remove every grizzled beast among the sheep, and every spotted and speckled beast among the goats; and let such henceforth be my hire." There will then be nothing redundant: yet I prefer the other reading, on this general principle, That few interpolations have crept into the Hebrew Text, compared to the many mutilations it has undergone. Besides, verse 35. is a guarantee for the order of the present Hebrew, and, I presume, for the alterations which I have made in it.

V. 37. *Plane-tree*. עֵרְמוֹ. Sep. *πλωτανος*. Vulg. *platanus*, whom I have followed. See explanatory note, and correct *platenus* into *platanus*. The other versions vary: and, indeed, it is very uncertain what peculiar tree is here meant.

Ver. 40. It is hard, if not impossible, to make any tolerable meaning out of the Text as it stands at present, and which is thus literally rendered in our public version: "And Jacob did separate the lambs, and set the faces of the flocks toward the ring-freaked, and all the brown in the flock of Laban." Let him, who can, make any thing of this †.

The chief difficulty lies in these words וְיָמַן פְּנֵי דִשְׁאָן אֶל עֵקֶה. Instead of עֵקֶה אֶל, Sam. has עֵקֶה אֶל a *variegated ram*; and so Sep. *κρίον διαλακκον*. But neither does this reading agree with the context, nor make any good sense. The Latin Vulgate is yet more wild: "*Et posuit virgas in canalibus ante oculos arietum*!" Syr. followed the present Hebrew, but gave a different meaning to עֵקֶה. Onkelos, the Targum of Jonathan, and Saadiah, seem to have read אֶל instead of אֶל; which reading is adopted by Houbigant, and gives an excellent meaning; which I have followed in my version. Perhaps the present reading might be defended, by making אֶל here the sign of the objective case, as it sometimes is: but אֶל or אֶל would certainly be more natural, and exclude all ambiguity. With respect to פְּנֵי, it often stands for לְפָנֵי, and may be here rendered *beside*, *opposite to*, *apart from*: and was so understood by the three last-men-

* Saadiah seems also to have read it in his copy.

† I mean the common printed editions; for 5 of Holmes's mss. with Cyr. Alex. have, after *προβατων—ποικιλον και περιτρον*—or *περιτρον*; which may be the production of some emendator, on comparing his Greek exemplar with the Hebrew.

‡ "Scripturam talem frustra interpretari velis." Houbigant.

tioned ancient translators. I have taken no notice of Dathe's and Michaëlis's versions *; nor of Delgado's transposition, because I deem them all ill-founded.

CHAP. XXXI.

Ver. 15. *AS strangers.* בְּנִכְרִים. So Sam. and the versions mentioned in explanatory note: to which add Gr. Ven. which has *ὡς ἀλλοτρία*. It is to be observed that neither Houbigant nor Kennicott take any notice of this variety of lection in the Sam. copies.

Ver. 18. The parenthesis in this verse is wanting, as I have remarked in Various Readings, in Syr. Arab. and 4 mss. but not in either Sep. or Vulg. as De Rossi too rashly asserts. The former expresses it after *Phadan-Aram*, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἑαυτοῦ: the latter more briefly, by *quidquid*. It is also equivalently in Onkelos, although omitted by his Latin translator.

Ver. 20. *Thus Jacob eluded Laban.* יָנַב אֶת לֵב לָבָן. Lit. *stole Laban's heart*; or rather his *mind*, that is, his *attention*; an Hebraism somewhat like the κλεπτε νοῦ of Homer.

Ver. 29. *In my power, &c.* וְיָ לֹא יֵדִי, which Arias Montanus literally renders *est ad fortitudinem manus mea*. Pagninus, *fortitudo in manu mea est*. Sep. *ερχου* (8 mss. *ερχου*) ἢ *χρη μου*, Vulg. *valet manus mea*. And so equivalently all the ancient versions. Michaëlis, however, has struck out a new version, which is at least specious. He thinks *יָ* means here *God*: and renders *Est pro Deo manus mea*; that is, *My own hand is a God sufficient for me*. So Mezentius in Virgil. *Æn.* 10. ver. 773.

*Dextra, mihi Deus, et telum, quod missile libro,
Nunc adsint*

But it is not probable that Laban, who everywhere else appears very religious, should on this occasion be so outrageously blasphemous. The common version, therefore, seems far the more preferable †.

Ver. 32. *And take it.* Sep. adds, "but nothing could he detect with him," καὶ οὐκ ἐνεργεῖται πᾶς αὐτῷ αἰθεν. Nobilius mistakes, when he affirms that these words are wanting in Complut. They are there, only with the variation of *αἰθεν* for *αἰθεν*: the former of which is also the textual reading of 3, and the marginal reading of 2 mss.: and so read Chrysostom.

Ver. 38. *These twenty years, &c.* Dr. Kennicott ‡ fancied that these twenty years are different from those mentioned ver. 41. and would render thus, ver. 38. "*During the one twenty years, &c.*: ver. 41. *During the other twenty years, &c.* He supposes that Jacob was, altogether, 40 years in Phadan-Aram; namely, 14 years as a covenant-servant for Rachel and Lea; 20 in Laban's neighbourhood as a friend; and 6 in Laban's house, a covenant-servant for cattle. By this distribution, he thinks, we are delivered from the *distresses* and *contradictions* that attend the chronology of Jacob.—But whatever become of Chronology, which is extremely uncertain both here and in many other places, certain I am that the Hebrew Text admits not

* The latter took לָבָן to be an appellative noun, and thus translates: "und stellet die weissen schafe so, das sie den an den füßen gezeichneten gegen-über stunden."
† Yet the Greek translator of Venice appears to have had the same idea as Michaëlis: *ἐστὶ τῶν θεῶν χεὶρ ἢ ἐμῇ.*

‡ *Remarks on Select Passages*, p. 26, &c.

of such an interpretation; and that the 20 years in ver. 41. are no other than the 20 years in ver. 38.

Ver. 39. *I was scorched*, &c. The present Text has נִבְרַתִּי; Sam. נִבְרַת, which Houbigant supposes to be the true reading; "Superfluit in fine, ex falsa iteratione litteræ יוּם subse-
quentis, et in altero נִבְרַתִּי ex falsa imitatione mendi prioris." The Sam. reading seems, indeed, to have been that of Sep. κλεμματα ἡμερας, και κλεμματα νυκτος. And so perhaps Syr. Vulg. and Erp. Arab. although they render in the singular. None of them express the affix: which seems here awkwardly employed. The Latins said *furari alieni*: but I doubt if the Hebrew language admit of such an idiotism. Gr. Ven. clearly thought it could, and must have read as the present Text: for he renders, not inelegantly, κλαπεν μοι ἡμερας, κλαπεν μοι νυκτος.—I am decidedly of opinion that י made a part of the original word; but that the original word was not נִבְרַתִּי but נִבְרַתִּי; not a noun, but a verb in the first perf. sing. Both Onkelos and Saadiah, and even the Persian translator, considered it as such; and in truth they could hardly consider it otherwise if they read it with a *jod*. Had the writer meant it as a noun, he would most probably have used נִבְרַת, as in ch. 30. 33. Besides, the sentence is badly connected as it now stands: "What was *torn* I brought not to thee, I was accountable for it; and, *stolen* by day or *stolen* by night." Whereas make a verb of the word נִבְרַתִּי, changed into נִבְרַתִּי*, and join the whole comma to the following verse; the blemish will be turned into a beauty, and the energy of Jacob's words appear in its full force.

Ver. 44. *And let it be for a witness*. לְעֵד וְזֵכֶר Michaelis points לְעֵד, and renders *for ever*. But all the versions are against him; and the phrase is uncouth. If the writer had meant to express the duration of the covenant, he would, I conceive, have used לְעֹלָם. The emendation is ingenious, but not necessary.

Ver. 51. *Which thou hast erected*. It is clear from ver. 45, that Jacob erected the stone. The present Text then, which has יָרַדְתִּי, must be wrong; and the Sam. reading יָרַדְתָּ† right.

V. 53. *The Gods of our fathers*. The present Hebrew Text has *the Gods of their father*, which cannot be the genuine reading, if considered as a part of Laban's speech; but must be looked upon as a mere marginal note, which afterwards crept into the text. A more tolerable reading is that of 10 mss. and some copies of Onk. which have the copulative ו before אֱלֹהֵי; as if Laban had said, *The God (or Gods) of Abraham, and the God of Nabor, and the Gods of their father, judge*, &c.—Instead of אֱלֹהֵי, Sam. and three or four Heb. mss. with some copies of Onk. have אֱלֹהֵי; but this is a still less probable reading than the other.—In Sep. the Copt. version, and 2 Hebrew mss. the words are wanting ‡; and Houbigant, Kennicott,

* From נִבְרַת, which is not indeed elsewhere found as a verb in Hebrew; but in Chald. Syr. Sam. signifies *to parch*, *to be scorched*, &c.; and as a noun, even in Hebrew, it has in some sort that meaning. See Jud. 1. 15. where, what is commonly rendered a *south land*, is by Jerom not ineptly rendered *terram arenem*: and there is little doubt but that נִבְרַת, the *south*, imports a *dry quarter*.

† The printed Sam. Text יָרַדְתִּי; but 2 mss. have preserved the right reading יָרַדְתָּ, which Onk. and Saadiah must also have found in their copies. In Sep. Ald. Rom. Alex. and in the Copt. versions, the whole comma is wanting: but it is in Compl. and some mss. which however have εἰρησεν. Only one ms. (135) has the right reading εἰρησεν. It is remarkable that Gr. Ven. has αἰεταλομεν; and so, it seems, the Armen. version.

‡ They are, however, in 5 of Holmes's mss. and in the Armen. version.—Some Hebr. mss. have אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ *your father*; an evident corruption.

and Bp. Law deem them a mere interpolation. They can certainly be easily spared: but as I am averse from admitting interpolations without strong motives, I think the true reading מַלְאָכֵי אֱלֹהֵינוּ has been preserved by the Syr. translator: and this reading I have followed in my version: only rendering מַלְאָכֵי in the plural, as more agreeable to the context. For the same reason, I prefer the reading of the present Heb. שָׁשׁ, which is that of Onk. Tharg. Arab. Etp. Perf. and Gr. Ven. to the Sam. reading שָׁשׁ, followed by Sep. Syr. Vulg. and Arab. Pol.

C H A P. XXXII.

Ver. 1. *Angels of God.* מַלְאָכֵי אֱלֹהִים. The word מַלְאָךְ properly signifies a messenger; and the angels or messengers here mentioned are considered by Abernethy as common travellers, from whom Jacob received the first intelligence of the approach of Esau.—Josephus calls them *phantoms*, φαντασματῶν: and, in truth, the whole story has more the air of a vision, than of a real occurrence. It seems to be the counterpart of the vision mentioned ch. 28. 12. It was not out of the road of nature to *dream* that the same God who had, in a *dream* at Bethel, encouraged him to proceed without fear on his journey into Mesopotamia, should on his return to Chanaan appear again to him for a similar purpose.—See the next Remark.

Ver. 24, &c. all to ver. 29. seems to be a mere vision or dream. The only objection to this is, that Jacob halted after the vision was over. To this objection I shall oppose the answer of Rosenmüller, without laying much stress upon it. “Nec obstat somnio, quod Jacobus mane claudicasset, quum notum sit, phantasie in dormientibus vim nonnunquam tantam esse, ut id quod in somnio læsum videbatur corporis membrum, ex somnio expergefaceris et vigilantibus verè doleat.”—There is a similar story, in Lycophron, of Jupiter’s wrestling a whole night with Hercules, by whom he was overcome.

Ver. 25. *On the hollow of the thigh.* כַּף יָד. What part this was has been a subject of controversy among interpreters. It is rendered by Sep. το πλάτος του μέρου. Vulg. *nervum femoris*. Syr. כַּף יָד, rendered in the Polyglott *convam*, but which should, I think, be rendered *palman*, as the כַּף יָד of Onkelos is rightly rendered *palman femoris**.—Saadias has כַּף יָד, which is commonly rendered *ischium* or *acetabulum*: but I question whether it have not here the same meaning with the Chaldee כַּף יָד. The Persic has כַּף, the very Hebrew word, and of the same meaning; namely, the interior *palm* of the hand. Gr. Ven. κοτύλη, that is, the *hollow* of the huckle-bone, as it is vulgarly called: but it may design any other *hollow*, as well as the other ancient versions.—Most modern translators have agreed in rendering the word by *acetabulum*; or some such word; that is, the *pan* which receives the *os femoris* or *buckle-bone*.—I cannot think that this is the meaning of כַּף, which denotes a small *curvature* like the interior *palm* of the *hand*, or that of a *spoon*, *sawcer*, &c. After having consulted several anatomists on the subject, I received from Dr. Baillie of Wind-mill-street the following very satisfactory answer: “There is no term of the *hollow of the thigh* used among anatomists: but Dr. B. thinks that the

* The Thargum of Jonathan has the same words, although they are rendered *latitudinem femoris*. The Jerusalem copy retains the Hebrew word כַּף, which is well rendered *vola*.
† Arab. Etp. has כַּף, if it be not an error of the Press.

"passage may be explained, with some plausibility at least, in the following manner:—At the upper part of the thigh, near the buttocks, there is, in the living body, a very considerable hollow between the upper part of the thigh bone and the *glutæi* muscles which constitute the buttock. This hollowness is especially to be seen when a person stands very upright, the *glutæi* being called into action*. The hollow is so very considerable, as to be observable to any common observer: and a most natural expression for it might be the *hollow of the thigh*†. At this place, any external force may be readily and immediately so applied as to throw the thigh-bone out of its situation; producing that sort of luxation, by which the limb is rendered longer than that on the other side. This explanation appears to Dr. B. to be tolerably clear and natural: whether it may be perfectly intelligible or satisfying to a person not conversant with anatomy, he cannot say."—To me, who am no anatomist, it is perfectly satisfactory: and I think it is the best commentary that ever was made on the passage.

Ver. 28. *For with God thou hast contended*, &c. The Text is כִּי שָׂרִית עִם אֱלֹהִים וְעִם אַנְשִׁים וְיָרָל, without any variety of lection either in the Sam. or Heb. copies; and which cannot be rendered any other way than I have rendered. Houbigant, however, and, after Houbigant, Dathe, and Rosenmüller (misled, I think, by Vulg. and the common edition of Sep.) have given to the passage another turn, and, pointing after אֱלֹהִים, render, or rather paraphrase, thus: "Quoniam ipsi Deo prevaluisti, e certamine cum hominibus superior quoque discedes." They reject the copulative before וְיָרָל, and ground the rejection partly on the authority of Sep. and Vulg.; and partly, because, in their apprehension, the sense and context require it. Jacob, says Dathe, had not yet contended with men: so his contest with the angel was meant to be a pledge of success, if in future he should have to contend with men.—But this is not just reasoning. He had contended with Esau, and supplanted him of his birth-right—he had contended with Laban, and got the better of him—He has now risen higher in the scale, and contended with God—He is therefore to be called ISRAEL, as well as JACOB‡.—All the antient translators read וְיָרָל, and understood it as I do, except Jerom, who, in his Heb. Q. thus renders: *Quia invaleuisti cum Deo, et cum hominibus valebis*.—The Septuagint version has also been forced to speak the same language: Ὅτι ἐνισχυσας μετὰ Θεοῦ, καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός ἐσθι. So the Roman edition. But Ald. Compl. Alex. and 27 mss. with Origen, Euseb. and Cyr. Al. want ἐσθι §: and, if this be the true reading, and properly pointed, the Greek will be conform to the Hebrew, and to the other Antient versions.—The Greek of Venice has very literally rendered the original: ἡξίας γὰρ σὺν Θεῷ καὶ σὺν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ισχυρός.—Among moderns, Michaëlis has followed the same meaning: Denn du hast mit Gott und menschen gekämpft, und obgefict "get."—Not badly Delgado, though uncouthly: "Thou hast made thyself a lord both over

* In the act of wrestling, I doubt not but this hollow is still more conspicuous. † If my memory fail me not, this very hollow is, in some parts of Scotland, called the *kap*, or *cap*, of the thigh. The same word was formerly used for a round small dish, not unlike a sawcer, for drinking ale and whiskey. It is indeed the Hebrew word, and of the same original import; for, in all probability, the first drinking-*kap* was the cavity of the hand. The Swedish *küpp*, the Dutch and Danish *kop*, and our *cup*, come all from the same source. ‡ This last name fitted him with respect to his victories over Esau and Laban; which were obtained by *supplantation*, cunning, and dissimulation; but his prevailing over God was the consequence of a fair struggle, expressed by the name of *Israel*. § One we, has α: and so the old Italic in Ausim: "Quia valuisti cum Deo et cum hominibus, potens es."

angels and over men, and thou didst prevail."—This learned ~~and liberal~~ Jew seems to adopt the opinion of those expositors, who "think there is no reality in this narrative; and that what Scripture saith, That he, Jacob, *rose up at night*, &c. is the relation of a prophetic vision to the "end of the chapter."

C H A P. XXXIII.

Ver. 13. *GIVING suck.* חָלַץ by our translators rendered *with young*: but as in 1 Sam. 6. 7. 10. "it must signify cattle which have brought forth; it should here and in Ps. 78. 71. and "Is. 40. 11. in which only places besides it occurs, since it may, it should probably be so interpreted." Secker's *Ms. Notes*. So the Ant. versions, except Sep. Vulg. and Perf.—Even Gr. Ven. has θηλαξουσιν.

Ver. 18. *Jacob arrived safe.* וְיַעֲקֹב עָמַר שָׁלֵם. Our translators, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. make עָמַר a proper name, *Salem* or *Shalem*. But this is a mistake, rectified by Josephus, Onk. and all the other versions; even Gr. Ven. which hath rightly σως. Both Purver and Delgado have here properly corrected the common translation.—It is strange that this correction did not occur to the all-correcting Houbigant.

Ver. 19. *For an hundred kestas.* I have retained the Hebrew word כֶּסֶת because its precise meaning is not known. Most interpreters, after Sep. have understood it of *lambs*, more particularly *ewe-lambs*. So equivalently all the Ant. versions.—Some have imagined that it was a piece of money with the figure of a lamb on it: which is highly improbable; as coined money is of a much later date. Others, with Faber, fancy, it might have been a silver or gold *vase*, or *platter*, which was anciently given in change, in lieu of money. I suspect the word is of Syriac extraction, should be written with a *samach**, and rendered a *belt* or *girdle*. It is well known in what value *belts* were anciently holden. The Greek *μαζος* and the Latin *ceftus* are thence probably derived.

C H A P. XXXIV.

Ver. 1. *To visit the young women of the land*; probably at some general festival or assembly. She was curious, perhaps too curious, to see their customs, &c.—The ingenious J. M. Lobstein, from a reading of the Genovesan copy of the Sam. text, has attempted to shew that Dina did not go out of mere curiosity to see the Chanaanite women: but to *be seen*, and exhibit her own superior charms. "Ut formam, qua sibi mirificè placebat, terræ incolis conspiciendam præberet." Admitting this reading (לִרְאוֹת, instead of לִרְאוֹת) the words should be rendered *comparere inter filias terræ*; *to be seen among the young women of the land*. But as all the other copies and versions read as we now do, I see no reason for throwing upon poor Dina more guilt than she seems to have incurred. The objection to the present reading, drawn from the ב before בָּנֹת is not of much force. Several instances occur where it is placed in the same sort of construction. Thus Cantic. 6. 11. לִרְאוֹת בְּתוֹבֵי דָדָא. See also 1 Sam. 6. 20. Heb. 1. 5.—Dina then did not

* Even the Masoretes point the *w* as a *fs*; which is equivalent to *samach*.

go to be gazed at by the young women of the country, but to gaze at them. The meaning is well expressed by Sep. καταμθεω; and still better by Jonathan: לִימְדוּ בְנֵימָם *inspicere consuetudinem, to observe the manners*. Perhaps to look at would be the best, as well as the most literal English translation.—Michaëlis: “Bekanntschaft zu machen”—to make acquaintance with.

Ver. 14. The addition from Sep. wrongly marked among Var. Read. as belonging to v. 13. is so likely to have stood originally in the text, that I had once a great mind to insert it. It is, partly in all the known copies: and marked with an *obelos* in only two mss*. The last words and sons of Lea are wanting indeed in Compl. Rom. and Alex. but they are in Ald. and more than 30 mss. as also in the Copt. Arab. and Armen. versions, made from the Greek.

C H A P. XXXV.

Ver. 4. *THE pendants that were in their ears.* דְּחוּסִים אֲשֶׁר בְּאוּדֵיָם. This is a clear proof that דָּחוּסִים means not precisely an *ear-ring*, nor a *nose-ring*; but something applicable to both: I have therefore always rendered it by a more general term, *pendant*. Those pendants seem to have been considered as sacred *amulets* or *talismans*; and had probably imprinted on them the rude figure of some profane divinity. See Le Clerc, and Maimonides.

Ver. 9. Delgado thinks that this and what follows, to the end of ver. 22. must be understood as if written before ver. 17. of ch. 33. I see no necessity for this supposition. The remark of the historian, that this happened after Jacob had come from Phadan-Aram, was meant only to discriminate this appearance of the Deity from that which took place before he went to Phadan-Aram.

Ver. 10. I have remarked in my Explan. Note, that the words *So his name was called Israel* are wanting in Syr. and most copies of Sep. that is, they are only found in Ald. and Rom. but wanting in Compl. Alex. and 26 mss. nor were they read by Justin Mart. nor by Nicetas:—they are in one ms. with an asterisk; and were read by Jerom, Q. Hebr.

Ver. 21. It is clear to me that Sep. has here alone preserved the due order of the narrative, by placing what is in the present text after ver. 20. immediately after ver. 15. Ἀπαρὰς δὲ Ἰακώβ ἐκ Βαβυλῶν, ἐπέξῃ τῇ σκηνῇ αὐτοῦ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ πυργου Γαδερ. κ.τ.λ. Let the reader transfer it to where it now stands in the Hebrew, and say if it come in there naturally.

1b. *Beyond Migdol-Eder.* Probably the same with that mentioned in Michah 4. 8. Whether this tower were not far from Bethlehem, or near to the Sheep-gate of Jerusalem, if Moses had written this, he would not, he could not have expressed himself in this manner. In describing a journey from Bethel to Bethlehem, he could not with propriety say of any intermediate place that Jacob had come *beyond it*, when such or such an event happened: whether he be supposed to have written his history in Egypt, or on his way to Chanaan. But, indeed, every thing convinces me, that the Pentateuch, as we now have it, was composed at Jerusalem, or at least in Palestine.

* The collator adds Alex. But this and other marks in that edition belong not to the *codex* itself; any more than the additions in a smaller character. All this is the work of the editor. The *ms.* is fully expressed, either in the text or margin, in one uniform letter of a larger size. Those who use Dr. Holmes's Collation must always keep this in mind.

Ver. 16. *But a little way.* עַד כְּבֶרֶת *וְדָרֶץ. It is generally agreed that the word כְּבֶרֶת denotes some measure of length; but what measure, it is not so easy to determine. Some, deriving the word from the verb כָּבַר, make it an indefinite term, signifying *a great way*. So Tharg. Bab. and R. J. Menahem. Others derive it from כְּבֶרֶת *food* (considering the כ as a prefix) and think it means as much ground as one can walk over from morning to meal-time: a fanciful and forced explanation. Jarhi is of opinion that it was about a German mile: and this idea has been adopted by Michaëlis, Dathe, Schulze, Rosenmüller &c. They were chiefly induced to this, by the distance which Rahel's tomb, according to travellers and geographers, is now from Bethlehem. But who will assure us that what is now called Rahel's tomb, is the real place where she was interred? We know that tombs, like catacomb-relics, have been arbitrarily christened, if I may here use the term: and the authority of a Benjamin Tudelensis, an Abulfeda, or even of a Jerom or Eusebius, is in such cases not always to be relied on. All that we know of Rahel's sepulchre is from 1 Sam. 10. 2. and from Jerem. 31. 15, quoted by Matthew 2. 28. From the former passage we learn that the tomb of Rahel was on the way from Rama to Gabatha-Benjamin; by the latter, that it could not be far from Rama; and by Matthew's application of it to Herod's infanticide, that it must have been in the vicinity of Bethlehem.—From the Ant. Versions little light is thrown upon the subject. Sep. retain the Hebrew word *כִּיבְרַת*. In P. P. indeed, ch. 48. 7. they have *κατα τον ιντροδομον χιβραθ της γης*: where I conceive *ιντροδομον* to be their interpretation of *כִּיבְרַת*; which in pointing ought to be included in a parenthesis: as if in an English version we were to say: “And had but a little way (*chibrath*) to arrive at Ephrath.”—Syr. פִּרְסָא which, in the Polyglott, is rendered *stadium*. But I take it to be the same with the Persic פרסنگ or פרסה, which latter is the very reading of the Persic version; and favours the opinion of those who are for a German mile, or *parasang*. Both Arabs have *a mile* مِيل, or 1000 paces; and this may be accounted *a little way* compared with *a parasang*.—Onkelos has כְּבֶרֶת, indeterminately rendered by his Latin translator *spatium*; but which I am persuaded means *a furlong*, from כָּבַר *to plow*: and this I take to be the most probable of all the versions.—The author of the Latin Vulgate gave another turn to the passage, *verno tempore*; which opinion he seems to have borrowed from certain Jewish interpreters, who, according to Jarhi, imagined that the historian meant to describe that season of the year when the earth was *bored* as it were like a *seve*, כְּבֶרֶת; namely after the winter frosts, at the commencement of *spring*. But Jerom in his Q. Hebr. explains it more fancifully still. After observing that Aquila had rendered *καθ' οδον της γης* in *itinere terræ*, he adds: “Sed melius est si transferatur in *electo† terræ tempore*. Poro *“vernum tempus* significat; quum in florem cuncta rumpuntur; et anni tempus *electum* est: *“vel quum transeuntes per viam carpunt et eligunt e vicinis agris quidcunque ad manus “venerit.”* I hardly think that any modern will *pluck* and *choose* this interpretation.—Singular is the rendering of Gr. Ven. *κατα σημειον της γης*. Had he the Arabic בֶּרֶת in view; which signifies *duz* vel *index itineris*—*a way-post* †!

* I suspect that the כ in וְדָרֶץ has been disjoined from the preceding word, and that the true reading is כְּבֶרֶת וְדָרֶץ, which is still that of one ms. and must have been that of Sep. Comp. ch. 48. 7. and 2 K. 5. 19. † From בֶּרֶת *eligers*. ‡ Which *way-post* or *index* might be some lofty *pine*, or other *tree*; which בֶּרֶת in Hebrew signifies. See Cant. 1. 7. where our translators have *fir*.

Let us now see what help can be had from the other few places in which the word is found. These are only two: Gen. 48. 7. and 2 K. 5. 19. In the former it is only a repetition of the passage here. In the latter it denotes the space of ground which Naaman had passed when Gehazi went after him to beg a present. Now this alone seems to afford a proof that the space was short: for it is not credible that Gehazi's avidity would let the Syrian proceed a whole German mile, before he thought of pursuing him. On the whole, then, I think that כְּבֵרִית, or כְּבֵרֶת, denotes a short space of way: and perhaps our first English translators, Coverdale, Matthew, &c. were not far wrong in calling it a *field-breadth*; i. e. a *furlong*: with which, I believe, the *ἡμετέραν* of Sep. and the כְּרֹב of Onkelos nearly accord. It is remarkable that in Spanish, or rather Morish, *huesbra* is an *acre* of ground, or *day-work* of land. See Minshew's Spanish Dictionary. Perhaps the Hebrew word might be not ineptly derived from כ and בְּרִית contracted into כְּרִית and rendered a *fragment*, *division*, or *cut* of ground: as we still provincially say, "there is a large *cut* of ground between such a place and such another place." Be this as it may, I am fully persuaded that the word denotes no great space; and have, therefore, with Ainsworth and our Public version, rendered a *little way*.

Ver. 22. The addition in this verse from Sep. is, says Rosenmüller, a *frigid* addition. But why? Was it not very natural for Jacob to be displeased, on hearing that his own son had violated his bed? The Masoretes themselves were sensible, that there was here a chasm in the text: and surely that chasm cannot be better filled up than by the words in Sep. *וְהָיוּ עֵינָיו מְרִירִים מִכָּל הַיּוֹם* (or *מִכָּל הַלַּיְלָה*) *אֲחֵרָא*. Hebr. וְהָיוּ עֵינָיו רָע. *Et fuit in oculis ejus malum.*

C H A P. XXXVI.

I HAVE not attempted to reconcile this chapter with ch. 26. with respect to the genealogies of Esau and Seir; because I found it a task beyond the compass of my abilities; without splashing the text in almost every verse, and bending it to wild conjecture: which I am never willing to do with the text of any author. Those who wish to see what efforts have (vainly, I think) been made to save the consistency of our historian may read what has been written by Michaëlis in the 9th tome of his *Oriental Library*, his *Dissertation on the Troglodytes*, and his German Notes on the Bible for the use of the unlearned. They may also consult Delgado's *observations* on the place: where they will see how far religious prejudice will lead an acute and sensible man, in support of the integrity of the Hebrew text.

Ver. 24. *These were the sons of Zibeon: Ajah, and Anah.* The present text has וְאִיָּה; hence some have imagined, that a name, or more, may have been dropt. But the Sam. text and version, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. and 4 mss. have וְאִיָּה without the copulative; which is also wanting, says De Rossi, in the original edition of Saadias printed at Constantinople in Hebrew characters: and, what is more singular, it is wanting in the very literal Greek version of Venice, which has *Ὀὐδὲ δὲ τῆς Σαδίας, Αἰας τε καὶ Ἀνάς*.

Ib. *It was this Anah who discovered the hot-baths &c.* The Hebrew word, which I render *hot-baths* is וְחִמְסִים; but Sam. has וְחִמְסִים: which variety of lection has given rise to various explanations. Those who follow the Sam. reading render "He found, i. e. he met with, *Emims*, "that is *giants*" &c. Onkelos seems so to have read, as he renders גְּבִירִים. This idea was adopted by

by Bochart, and defended by Simon in his Answer to Le Clerc: but has been generally abandoned by more modern critics *. The Thargumists make מולות *mules*, and think that Anah was the first who reared them. The Persic interpreter was of the same opinion. Sep. and the other three Greek translators retained the Hebrew word: but it is hard to say whether they followed the Hebr. or Sam. lection. In the copies of Sep. we find it in all the following varieties: אמר, אמרנ, אמרנא, אמרנ, אמרנ, אמרנ, אמרנ. One ms. only has אמרנ; and so read Jerom, *Lamim*: and this I take to be the original reading. This was also the reading of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, according to Montfaucon: but we learn from Jerom, Q. Heb. that the two former read אמר. Hence rightly Scharfenberg: "Præferendam esse puto lectionem *אמר* *אמר*, quam Aquila e codd. mss. restituit Vallartius; cui et libenter in eo assentior, quod Aquilam et Symmachum (nam et hic scripsit *אמר*, non, ut Montef. edidit, *אמרנ*) dicit proprio nomine *Emim* intellexisse, genus gigantum, quorum origo et sedes Horæis finitimæ Deut. 2. 2. describuntur." But this to me is noway convincing: nor can I think the giants have any thing to do here. "He found giants in the desert" is an uncouth expression: and if the *Emites* were a neighbouring people to the *Horites*, they could not be unknown to them.—I have therefore preferred the Hebrew reading, and rendered it with Vulg. and some interpreters mentioned by Jerom, *hot-baths*. "Nonnulli (says he) putant *aquas calidas*, juxta Punicæ linguæ viciniam, quæ Hebrææ contermina est, hoc vocabulo signari." The Syr. Translator seems to have considered it in this light; as he renders it מים *waters*: or, as Theodoret says, *מים* a fountain. ἡ γὰρ πηγή Αἴνα καλεῖται τῇ Συρίῳ φωνῇ. Theodor. vol. i. p. 101. nov. edit.—Both Arabs and Gr. Ven. follow the Thargums; and, with our common version, have *mules*.—Dathe: *thermas*.—Michælis: *die bader*.

1b. *When he was feeding the asses, &c.* Asses, as well as camels, are said to be very sagacious in discovering water, even under ground; and smelling it at a considerable distance. It might then be the asses, which Anah fed, that led him to the discovery of some copious spring, or perhaps lake† of water; whether *hot* or *cold*, may be questioned: but still a copious source of water in those arid regions would be accounted a capital discovery, and recorded by the historian as an important event.

Ver. 25. *The sons of Anah: Dishon . . .* A name may have been lost after *Dishon*: but I think the integrity of the Text may be defended. The word נר in the masculine plural here, is not more ungrammatical, than would be in Latin: *Nati sunt ei filius et filia*.—The Greek of Venice has therefore properly rendered; Ὅδε δὲ υἱὸς Ἀναν, Δισων καὶ Αἰδασμας, θυγατὶς Ἀναν.

Ver. 31. *These are the kings, &c.* This and the 12 following verses were by Spinoza urged as one clear proof that the Pentateuch could not be written by Moses: if he had only said that *this part* of the Pentateuch could not be written by Moses, he would have said no more than

* Except Houbigant: who renders "qui dimicavit in deserto contra Emæos," &c. but, as our Bate has well observed, מול never signifies to *fight with*: but to *meet*, or *come up with*. † A lake of water was, in Hebrew, called a *sea*. The remark of Jerom is here to the purpose. "Iisdem litteris scribuntur maria (*aiamin*) quibus et hic nunc sermo descriptus est. Et volunt (quidam) illum [Anam], dum pascit asinos patris sui in deserto, aquarum congregationes reperisse: quæ, juxta idioma linguæ, Hebræicè maria nuncupantur: quod scilicet *lagnum* repererit, cujus rei inventio in eremo difficilis est." Q. Hebr.

what every discerning reader must, in my conception, acknowledge. Nothing to me can be more evident than that all this was written after there were kings, or at least a king, in Israel.—But no, says Rosenmüller and some other modern critics: “Evanescit hæc difficultas, si in memoriam revocamus, id quod Moses ipse paullo ante, c. 35. 11. narrat: Deum scilicet Jacobo promississe, fore ut ex eo reges orirentur. Vult igitur ille his verbis: *Edomitæ jam octo reges habuerunt*, antequam Deus promissum illud Jacobo datum in posteris ejus impleteret.”—I confess this is an argument I do not comprehend.—Delgado takes another, more ingenious method; and renders his Text thus: “Now these are the kings that reigned in the country of Edom, before the king that reigned cotemporary with the children of Israel.” But this is as forced, and far-fetched an interpretation as can well be made. The grammatical reason is, that, except in this place, מלך is constructed with a ו or an ה, and never with a ה. But surely he is not to learn, that ה holds frequently the place of a ה; and must, in English, be rendered *over* *. See Noldius. Not one of the Ant. translators so much as dreamed of this refinement: and yet I presume they understood the Hebrew idiom as well as Delgado, or his R. D. Kimhi. As the Greek version of Venice excellently renders the passage, and is less known than the Polyglott versions, I shall here content myself with giving it entire: Οὗτοι θ' οἱ βασιλεῖς, ὅτε περ ἐβασίλευσαν ἐν τῇ γῇ Ἐδωμων, πρὸ βεβασίλευκεαι βασιλεῖς τοῖς ἱσταν Ἰσραηλιν.

C H A P. XXXVII.

Ver. 2. *AN evil report.* Some Jewish rabbis have imagined that the report which Joseph brought to his father of his brothers, was their eating raw flesh torn from live animals.—Others, with Grotius, think it was a crime not to be named. Useless conjectures! And well says Jarhi: “He told his father all the ill he knew of them.” There is here an egregious error in the Rom. Aldine and Alex. copies of Sep. καταπνεῖλαι δὲ [κατα] Ἰωσήφ ψυχὸν πατρὸν. The word κατα, however, is in Ald. only; and this ought to have made the reading καταπνεῖλαι be suspected. Complut. has καταπνεῖμι; but this has been supposed to have been inserted without ms. authority; and to be one of those places which the editors corrected by the Hebr. and Vulg†. Luckily for their honour, I find that same reading in fix of Holmes’s ms. and in some Arabic versions made from Sep.—I shall, elsewhere, have occasion to shew how much the Complutensian editors have been injured by latter critics.

Ver. 3. *Because he was the son of his old age.* וְיָדָעְתָּ בְּיָמָיו כִּי Sep. ὅτι υἱὸς γῆρας [or γῆρας] ἦν αὐτοῦ†. So Vulg. though not so literally: eo quod in senectute genuisset eum. To the same purpose Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. But Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Persian translator understood the words יָדָעְתָּ בְּיָמָיו to signify a prudent child: lit. says Bp. Law (who seems to adopt this interpretation) *the son of the elders*. But this is a harsh and unnatural explication: and the other is evidently the meaning.

* Not to mention, that מלך is here in an unusual construction, both as noun and a verb together.

† Even Scharfenberg leans to this opinion. *Animadversiones ad Gen.* p. 37.

‡ It is worth remarking that instead of Jacob, which in the beginning of this verse is the reading of all the printed editions of Sep. and of the Copt. version, three of Holmes’s ms. with one or two Arab. and the Armenian version, have *Israel*. So read Jerom in the old Italic: and so all the other Ant. versions.

Ib. An embroidered coat. כְּתֹנֶת פָּסִים. By Montanus rendered *tunicam particularum*; a coat of patches. And this perhaps may be the literal meaning. Sep. χιτών ποικίλον. Vulg. *tunicam polymitam*. Syr. פִּדְמָה, rendered *fimbriatam* in Pol. but which, I think, would be better rendered *verficolorum*. Onklos retains the Hebrew term. Jonathan מְצוּר embroidered. Both Arabs رِيْبَان, rendered *sericam (filken)* in Pol. but which, I am persuaded, signifies the same thing. The Chald. מְצוּר, figured, embroidered, &c. Giggæus renders by the Italian word *broccado* (our *brocade*); and in this sense it was taken by the Perfic translator. The Gr. of Venice keeps close to his Hebrew; and renders *περὶ βραχίων πωλαμῶν*, a coat of hand-breadths*; as if every piece of it were no bigger than the palm of the hand.—Whatever were the form or colours of the pieces that composed it, it was a coat of distinction; and such as was worn by the daughters of kings. See 2 Sam. 13. 18. and the Rem. on that place.

Ver. 4. And could not speak to him peaceably. Better, perhaps: and would not give him the salutation of peace, שָׁלוֹם לְךָ. So Bp. Law in ms. notes.

Ver. 9. And eleven stars. I have not, with our public version, rendered *the eleven stars*; because, as Secker well observes, it is not known that any cluster of *eleven stars* was distinguished from the rest. They are here made *eleven* to equal the number of Joseph's brothers.

Ver. 25. I have said in my Explan. Note, that it is difficult to say what was the merchandize, which the Midianites were carrying to Egypt. I shall here lay their names before my reader, in the original and the antient versions; which he may examine at his leisure, and choose what he deems the most probable.—Hebr. נֶכְמֶת, צָר, לֶשׁ.—Sep. θυμιαματων, ῥητινης, στακτης.—Vulg. *aromata, refinam, flacten*.—Syr. رِيبَان, رِيبَان, رِيبَان.—Onk. שֶׁמֶךְ, קָפָן, לְשׁוֹם.—Tharg. שְׁמֶכֶת, קָפָן, לְשׁוֹם.—Saad. שְׁמֶכֶת, קָפָן, לְשׁוֹם.—Erg. שְׁמֶכֶת, קָפָן, לְשׁוֹם.—Perf. שְׁמֶכֶת, קָפָן, לְשׁוֹם.—Gr. Ven. ἀρωμα, βαλσαμων, μαστιχη. Such is the variance among the antient interpreters. Nor are the moderns much more agreed. The curious reader may consult on the subject, Bochart, Celsius, Hillerus; and with respect to צָר, *balsam*, a *Dissertation on the fertility of Palestine* by H. E. Warnekros, in Eichhorn's *Biblical Repertory*, tom. xv. p. 227, &c.—In my version I have used the names which I thought the likeliest to express the original terms: and have only to observe, that the word *laudanum* would be better written *ladanum*, or *ledanum*; not *labdanum*, as some moderns spell it: for neither Theophrastus nor Pliny so write it. Herodotus has also λαδανον “which (says he) the Arabs call λαδανον.”

C H A P. XXXVIII.

Ver. 1. AT that time. בֵּעֵת וְדָמָה. An indefinite mode of expressing any occurrence, or event, unconnected with any particular period: somewhat like the *τοτε* of the Greeks, and the *en τα καιρω ενωπι* of the N. T. Hence, in the Roman Missal, every Sunday-gospel begins with *In illo tempore*.

Ver. 14. At the gate of Enaim. בִּפְתַח עֵינַיִם. Interpreters differ about the meaning of עֵינַיִם. Is it a proper name, or an appellative? and if the latter, does it mean *fountains*, or *eyes*? Jerom is

* In Pl. 72. we find a word from the same root פָּס, denoting either a *handful*, or a *hand's-breadth*: or at least some very small quantity.

† These are made two drugs in the Latio, but I am persuaded they are but one compound.

for the latter: "Sensus est: sedit in *bivio*, five in *compito*; ubi diligentius debet viator aspicere, "quod iter gradiendi capiat:" hence Vulg. *in bivio itineris*, &c. The meaning, such as it is, is that it was a place where one must *open his eyes* to see which way he was to take. Syr. and Arab. seem to favour this explanation: and both Onkelos and Jonathan *may* be taken in the same sense; although I believe they had *fountains*, not *eyes*, in their view. The Peric translator is decidedly for *fountains*, נַחֲשִׁימִי. The Gr. of Venice has as plainly *eyes*: εν πύλαισι οφθαλμων.— I am inclined to think that *fountains* is the true meaning; but that it denotes the name of a place so called; as Sep. properly renders. *παρὰ τοὺς πύλας Ανοα* *. It was, no doubt, so called from the springs in its vicinity: as our *Wells* in Somersetshire, and elsewhere; *Wellingborough* in Northamptonshire; *Fontainebleau*, *Sept-fons*, and *Septfontaines*, in France. The Sam. version makes it the same with חַזִּיב *Chazib* mentioned ver. 5.

Ver. 18. *Thy signet, with thy ribband*: that is, the *string* by which the signet was suspended. In that manner are signets still worn in the East. See Chardin, Pietro della Valle, and other travellers. We must not however imagine that פֶּתֶל here signifies a *ribband* such as we now use; it was only a *twisted string*. The Ant. interpreters understood the word in another sense, and as a separate ornament: Sep. *סמיון*. Vulg. *armillam*. Onk. and Syr. *הַשֵּׁט*. Tharg. *שֵׁט*, badly rendered *pallium*. Saad *שֵׁט*. Erp. *שֵׁט* †. Peric *σφραγίδα*. Gr. Ven. *καλπτρα*.

Ver. 29. *What breach is this thou hast made?* מַה פְּרִצַּת עָלֶיךָ פֶּרַץ. The midwife was surprised at this violent and uncommon eruption: and it has been made an objection to the veracity of the fact, as being hardly possible. To shew the contrary, Michaëlis has given in his German Notes on the Bible two extracts from Professor Wrisberg, and Haller, which I subjoin in their own words. The former, who was professor of midwifery in the university of Göttingen, writes thus: "Bey einer frau auf dem lande, die wegen widernatürlicher lage des kindes bey "einer zwillings-geburth schon 48 stunden in geburtschmerzen zubebracht hatte, und die "herausgefallene hand des einen kindes ganz blau angelaufen war, wurde ich gerufen, nachdem "die hebamme, während ihrer mühsamen und doch überflüssigen beschäftigung die hand "wiederum zurück zu bringen, aus versehen die häute des anderen kindes schon zerrissen "hatte; nach deren zerreißung und darauf erfolgtem ausflusse des wassers, die in der nähe des "muttermundes liegenden füsse des anderen kindes beide in die geburt traten. Diese wurden "von mir zuerst ergriffen, und das annoch lebende kind daran herfürgezogen; worauf ich durch "die wendung das erste kind, welches mit seiner hand zuerst in die geburt getreten war, "und davon die deutlichsten beweiße durch die blaue farbe der aufgeschwollenen arme gab, "gleichfalls, wiewohl todt, zur welt brachte."—Haller's Letter to Michaëlis, dated May 2d, 1770, is as follows. "Ob der erste zwilling seine hand zurück ziehen kann?—Ich habe schon "geschrieben, blos die natur könne alles dergleichen bewirkt haben, wenn der kopf des zweiten "kindes zwischen den kopf des ersten und die mutter gedrückt wurde. Viel leichter gehet "es an, wenn man annimt, die wehmutter habe die füsse gesucht, um den ersten zwilling "zu wenden. Ist aber dieser handgriff in diesen ersten zeiten bekannt gewesen? Beym Celsus "sind spuren, bey dem angeblichen Hippokrates keine. Doch die Aegyptier, die erfinder der

* The variety in Holman's is hardly worth remarking; save that Jerom read *Enam*, more agreeable to the Hebrew letters.

† This is well rendered, and corresponds exactly with the Hebrew word. See the Root *פָּרַץ* in Castell's Lexicon.

"künste, können handgriffe gewußt haben, die in Griechenland nicht so ~~so~~ bekannt worden sind; und Aristoteles sagt, zwillinge seyn in Ägypten sehr gemein, folglich die nothwendigkeit dergleichen geburten zu befördern größer als in kältern ländern."—This remark is very pertinent; and is at least as applicable to the Hebrew women, as to the Egyptian. See the Remark on Exod. 1.—Having consulted some of the first practitioners in this metropolis, I am pleased to find that they agree in sentiment with Haller. The following letter was sent to me by Dr. Combe in 1793. "I think this (case) might naturally happen, in either of the two following positions of the children, when the mother has a large well-formed pelvis. 1st, If on the rupture of the membranes, the arm of one child be forced down with the head of the other, the hand of the first child, in a pain or two, will be even with the os externum, or a little lower: at the same time the head of the second child, occupying nearly the whole of the cavity of the pelvis, will prevent the head and body of the first child coming down: and, probably, after some ineffectual pains (the children being in this situation) the arm of the first child will, in the interval of pain, be a little drawn up; and a subsequent pain will force down the head of the second child; and thus the one who presented the hand first, will be born last.

"2dly, If, instead of the head, the breech of the second child be forced down* with the arm of the first, as before described, the event will be exactly the same."

Dr. Savage is of the same opinion; and although in his extensive practice he has not found a case similar to that of Tamar, and that mentioned by Dr. Wrisberg, yet he assures me that a German Doctor, who practised long in London, and whose name was Cobban†, had met with a case exactly similar.—Mr. Ring, whose practice is also extensive, and whose obstetric skill is unquestionable, coincides in opinion with the fore-mentioned physicians. So that, I think, the possibility of Tamar's case is indubitable.

C H A P. XXXIX.

Ver. 14. SHE called to her domestics. קָרָא לְאִשֵּׁי בֵּיתָהּ—lit. She called to the men of her house, i. e. the eunuchs who guarded her apartments; according to the eastern custom. Lobstein here again endeavours to justify the singular reading of the Genovesan ms. of the Sam. Text, which has לְאִשֵּׁי to the women, that were about her. His chief reason is that if she had addressed herself to men, she would not have said, that the young Hebrew had been brought in "to insult us" לְעִוְלָתָנוּ. But this appears to me a weak objection. She spoke as a woman of consequence: and this may be adduced as another example of a plural used for a singular. See the Rem. on Gen. 1. p. 8. second paragr. Or she might deem the insult offered to her guardians, as well as to herself. I therefore see no reason for admitting the Genovesan reading contrary to all the other copies, and all the Ant. versions.—The reading of this same ms. is more probable in

Ver. 20. Where the present text has וַתִּזְכֹּר אֶל־בֵּיתָהּ הָעִוְלָה, the Genovesan copy has וַתִּזְכֹּר both here and in vv. 21. 22. 24. I had long suspected that this latter might have been the original

* Which seems to have been the case with Dr. Wrisberg's woman.
doubtful about the orthography of the name,

† Or Cobburn: for Dr. S. seemed
reading,

reading, before I knew that Michaëlis had had the same idea. I am now almost convinced that it is; it being the reading of not only the Genovesan, but of 10 other Sam. mss*. It might be imagined, with some degree of plausibility, that Sep. read *סור*, as they render *σχυρωμα*; or that they understood *סור* in the same sense. This sense is confirmed by the radical meaning of *סור* in Chald. Syr. and Sam. dialects; in which it denotes an *inclosed, secluded, secure* place; *arx, turris, palatium*†: and surely no word can better denote a royal prison or *bastille*; such as this prison seems to have been. I am not even sure but that the Hebrew acceptation of the word, applied to *merchandise* and *merchandising* is to be sought in the idea of *inclosing* and *securing* goods in warehouses. See the Rem. on Jerem. 14. 28. and on Ps. 38. 10. and 91. 4.—I had almost omitted to mention the derivation of Aben-Ezrah, Bochart, Jablonski, &c. who make *סור*, or *סור*, a compound of two Coptic words, *SONH* and *AREH*: of which the former signifies *vinculus*, the latter *custodia*. If the word had been found only here, I should not object to this etymon: but in general I am not for seeking Hebrew words in a language with which the Hebrew dialect has little or no affinity.

C H A P. XL.

Ver. 4. *SOME* days. *ימים*, which Bp. Law thought might be *a week*. Others make it a whole year. I have, with all the Ant. versions, expressed it indefinitely.

Ver. 6. *He saw that they were troubled*. *ועינם*. Sep. *τεταραγμενοι*. Aq. *εμβροδομενοι*‡. Our translators followed Sym. and Vulg. *σαθηναι*, *tristes*: and so Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis.—It is not however the same word with that in the next verse, *רעם*; which, with me, they render *sad*. Sep. *σαθηναι*.

Ver. 13. *Will decide thy fate*. Bp. Law “Will call thee to account||—bring thee to trial.” which is the very rendering of the Sam. version. The other versions either retain the Hebraism, or give it the meaning of *culling to mind*.

Ver. 15. *In a dungeon*. *בבור*. The common meaning of *בור* is *a pit, well, cistern*; but here it is to be understood in a more unlimited sense: for Joseph seems to have then been a prisoner at large, at least within the precincts of the prison-house.

Ver. 16. *Wicker-baskets*. *סלי דור*. The last of these words is variously rendered. Sep. *αφροδισια*. Aq. *γυρως*. Sym. *βαϊνα*. Vulg. *farinae*§. Syr. *דורתא*** . Onk. *דור*††. Tharg. *פתח נקמ*‡‡. Arab. Pol. *دور*. Arab. Erp. *بور*. Persic: *دور* *foramibus*; which I take to be the true interpretation of the Hebrew word. At any rate the word *דור* or *דור* can be appli-

* I mention not the single Hebr. ms. which here agrees with those Sam. copies: but which in all the other places reads *סור*.

† Perhaps of a roundish figure; whence Purver seems to have taken the fancy of rendering it a *round-boule*.

‡ So also Gr. Ven. *τεταραγμενοι*. The other Ant. versions will, likewise, bear the same meaning.

|| So also Delgado in the very same words. § So Gr. Ven. *πελανο*. ** Rendered in Pol. *ciborum*

candidorum: but which, I apprehend, denotes rather the colour of the basket itself, than of the viands contained in it. Those baskets were made of *white twigs*, according to the notion of the translator: or perhaps his meaning, as well as that of Onkelos, may be *bale*.

†† Absurdly rendered *plena pane principali*. It seems rather to denote that the baskets were *plena foraminibus*: full of little interstices, as bread-baskets commonly are.

‡‡ Jerus. *דורא קקשון*.

cable only to the baskets, and not to their contents; and must be rendered either *white*, or *wicker*. Pagninus, Olcaster, Castalio, the Genevans, Le Clerc, &c. are for the former; for the latter, Jarhi, Junius, Houbigant, Dathe, and our first English translators. In the Bishop's Bible both epithets are joined "*white wycker baskets*;" but James's translators retained only the first, *white*; which Bate followed. It is rather strange that Michaëlis prefers *pastry-work*, "*back-work*."

Ver. 19. *Will decide thy fate*. After these words, in the present Hebr. and Sam. copies, we find the following word מַעֲלִיךְ; *from off thee*. Which in my Explan. Note, I have represented as an interpolation, arising from its proximity to the מַעֲלִיךְ at the end of the verse. It is wanting in one of Kennicott's mss. and was wanting at first in 2 of De Rossi's. But, on the other hand it is in all the Ant. ver. save Vulg. and I am not sure but it is there included in the word *auferet*. If it be genuine, we must here give a new meaning to the words שָׂם אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ, a meaning which I think they can hardly bear; and render "*Pharaoh will take off thy head*." But I believe, a single other instance cannot be produced, where שָׂם אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ signifies *to take off a head*. I am therefore still inclined to think that the first מַעֲלִיךְ in this verse is a very old interpolation; borrowed from the second מַעֲלִיךְ.

C H A P. XLI.

Ver. 2. *ON a meadow*. בְּנֶחֱדָה. Sep. *ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ**. Vulg. *in locis campestribus*. Onk. בְּנֶחֱדָה retaining the Hebrew word. Syr. בְּנֶחֱדָה *in viridario*. Tharg. בְּנֶחֱדָה *in medio pratorum*†. Saad. פִּי אֶלְקֶרֶט ‡ rendered *in gramine*: but the word is by some supposed to mean that particular grass called *sainfoin*, *onobrychis*. Ar. Erp. פִּי אֶלְקֶרֶט *in prato*. Perf. דֶּר עֲלִפְרָר *in gramineto*. Gr. Ven. *ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι*. Thus all concur in making it either *a meadow*; or grass growing on a meadow: but some of the terms are supposed to denote a particular grass. We learn from Jerom that the word *αγρῷ* was in his time considered as an Egyptian word, which signified *omne quod in palude virens nascitur*. The Coptic translator having retained the word *abi*, with the Copt. art. *pi*; makes this more probable. It is worth remarking that in the Celtic dialect formerly spoken in Scotland *ach* was the name for a *meadow* or *field*: and makes a part of many compound proper names in that country. The Scottish *hauch* ||, and the English *haugh* §, are of the same origin.

Ver. 16. *Without God*, &c. The Text has בְּלֹא־אֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֵה, literally rendered by Pagninus, *Præter me, Deus*, &c. So the Latin Vulgate, *Abſque me*, &c. and so equivalently Onk. both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven **. But the Sam. lection לֹא יַעֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים, which was

* So Vat. and Alex. But Compl. 1 ms. and Copt. have *αγρῷ*; and Ald. and 2 mss. have *αγρῷ*. Philo too has *αγρῷ*. Jerom (Comment. in H.) read *αγρῷ*, and I have little doubt but that the original reading of the Text was *אֱלֹהִים*. See the Remark on Eccius. 40. 16.

† So the Latin translator of Tharg. Bab. but the translation of Tharg. Jerus. is *in medio carethorum*; although it is the same word in the Chaldee.

‡ From which, I believe, comes the Latin *pratium*; *k* in *p* mutato: and not from the ridiculous etymon of Vulpian.

|| Dipple, Dundurcas, Doonaleith, and Devay

Are the three finest *hauchs* (meadows) along the Spey.

§ As in *Wooler-haugh-head*.

** *χαρις σου*.

followed by Sep. * and Syr. † appears to be by far the better reading; which I have accordingly followed in my version. Point, then, בלעדִי with a *tséré*: for there is no necessity of reading with Houbigant בל בלעדִי.—Michaëlis paraphrases thus: "This is above my power: God alone can give to the king a lucky and desirable answer."—Dathe: "Josephus vero negavit, sibi hanc inesse facultatem; interim sese vehementer optare, ut Deus ei salutaria indicet." Can this be called a *translation*?—Better Rosenmüller: "Nihil ad me: Deus respondebit pacem Pharaoni, &c." They all followed the present Masoretic reading.—But best of all, in my opinion, Houbigant: "Nemo, inquit, Pharaoni prospera nuntiare, sine Deo potest."

Ver. 34. *Take up a fifth part of the produce of the land.* חֲמִשָּׁה אֶת אֶרֶץ lit. *fifth the land*; as Secker renders; in the same manner as we say to *tithes*.

Ver. 38. *With a god-like mind.* מִשֵּׁר רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים בּוֹ. *In whom is the spirit of a god.* A pure Hebraism, denoting a superior degree of penetration and wisdom: as is well explained in the next verse.

Ver. 40. *At thy word shall all my people move.* עַל פִּיךָ יִשָּׁק בָּל עַם. Pagninus, deriving שָׁק from נָשָׁק, renders it *osculabitur*: and our Chandler was of the same opinion. But Secker justly observes that "עַל פִּי יִשָּׁק" cannot signify to kiss the mouth; but must be rendered *juxta mandatum*: but *osculari juxta mandatum* is no sense." Others, from the same root, would render it *armed*; as if Pharaoh had said: "all my people shall be *armed* at your command." The Thargums ‡, and the Greek of Venice § favour this interpretation. I derive the word from שָׁק, and take it in the meaning of *discursitare*, to be ready to run one's errand at his desire: *to move* at his pleasure: like the Centurion's servants in Matthew 8. 9. who *went*, when he said: *go!* and *came*, when he said: *come!*—Perhaps another meaning, equally probable, might be drawn from the same root שָׁק, in the sense which we give to תִּשְׁקֶט Gen. 3. 16. And so I think must Sep. be understood ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι σου ὑπακούσεται πᾶς ὁ λαὸς μου. And Vulg. *obediet*.—Rosenmüller prefers a meaning suggested by Lentz, who derives שָׁק from the Arabic שָׁק to which they give the signification of *pangere, compingere*; and then apply it metaphorically to the strict attention which the Egyptians were, by their King's order, to pay to Joseph's commands. "Per metaphoram aliquis *super* as vel *ori alterius apparatus* dicitur, qui ejus jussus perfectum obsequium præstare debet, ita ut ab ejus ore recedere seque avellere non possit. Simili quadam phrasi dicitur, *ab ore alicujus pendere*." This is quite in the manner of Schultens: that is, in my opinion, an unnecessary refinement. Were I to call in the Arabic here to aid, I would rather say, that the meaning is *ordinari*; to be always *ready* to receive orders: which would nearly fall in with our common version "be ruled."

Ver. 42. *Muslim.* שֹׁש. Forster has so ably proved this to be *cotton* (*gossypium arboreum*) that it now passes for unquestionable, among Biblical critics. See his work *On the Byssus of the Antients*, sect. 10. p. 46.—See also Pliny, l. 19. c. 1. and Pollux's *Onomasticon*, l. 7. c. 17.

Ver 43. *Abreeb.* אֲבֵרֶךְ. That this proclamation was made in the Egyptian tongue, we cannot entertain a doubt: but we are not quite so certain, that the Hebrew historian might not have given the Egyptian word a Hebrew turn; as, in my opinion, he has done with respect to

* Ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησεται τὸ σωτηριον Φαραω.

† סִבַּר אֵת' וְבִלְעַד אֱלֹהִים' נִעַדָּה שְׁלֹמֹה לְפָנָיו ?

‡ דַּוְדָּי.

§ ὁρᾷται.

the name of *Moses*.—Yet, every thing considered, it appears more probable, that here, at least, he retained the original term; and, therefore, we are naturally led to seek its etymology and meaning in the Egyptian language. Two learned authors, Jablonski and Forster, have accordingly given their explanations of *Abrech*, from the Coptic dialect. The former makes it a compound of *OUBE contra*, and *AKK inclinare, bow towards*. The latter composes it of *HA-TRE-CHEK*; which he renders *a-rege-cinctus*: as if the royal proclamation had been to this purpose: “Behold the man whom the king hath clothed:” similar to that in *Ester*: “Thus shall it be done to the man, whom the king delighteth to honour.”—This is ingenious; but I doubt much of the justness of the etymon; although my knowledge of the Coptic is yet too insignificant to qualify me a competent judge. The other derivation pleases me much better; the more especially as we learn from Origen (in *Catenis*) that the word in question implies *genusflexion*, *γονατίξιν*; which was most probably the very word used by *Aquila*, and not *πρυγκ*, as in *Montfaucon*. See *Bahrdr’s* edition of the *Hexapla*, t. 1. p. 252.—To the same purport the Latin *Vulg.* “ut omnes coram eo *genusflecterent*.” In a similar sense it was taken by Arab. *Erp.* *ARCEA*; and by *Gr. Ven.* *γονατισσιν*.—But what shall we say of the version of the Septuagint? which is as follows: *καὶ ἀναγγελεῖς* (or *ἐξαγγελεῖς*) *ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγγελεῖς*: *an herald proclaimed before him*. It is plain they either took *אברך* for a nominative agreeing with *יקרא* (for so they must have read in the sing. with *Sam.* and 3 MSS.) and considered it as equivalent to *ἀναγγελεῖς*; or omitted to translate it at all, which is hardly credible. It was their general custom, when they could not readily find a Greek equivalent, to retain the original word, as above in *אמ*, and below in *צפת-פער*: they would, then, have given us *ἀγγελος*, or some such word: if they had not looked upon *אברך* as an appellative Egyptian noun of the same meaning with *ἀναγγελεῖς* in Greek. I anxiously looked for some various reading in *Holmes*; but found not even the trace of one. Those translators, living at *Alexandria*, had it in their power to consult the *Copts* concerning the meaning of the word: and if they had not been convinced that it meant *ἀναγγελεῖς*, it is not at all probable that they would have used that term. In turning to the Coptic version, made from theirs, I find *ἀναγγελεῖς* rendered *ΑΠΙΚΤΡΙΑ*: did the translator borrow this from the Greek; or is it a real Coptic term? I have in vain looked for it in *La Croze*: but if it were a genuine Coptic word, perhaps, in the hands of a thorough Coptic scholar, it might be resolvable into our *אברך*.—Be this as it may, my great regard for the Septuagint makes me ever loth to abandon them, where their version has not been vitiated by careless copyists, or daring correctors.—With respect to the other antient translators, except the four already mentioned, they appear to have considered *אברך* not as an Egyptian, but an Hebrew compound of *אב* and *רך*: and they are generally agreed about the meaning of *אב*, but differ about the meaning of *רך*. The *Syr.* translator seems to have understood all that follows in the verse, as a part of the proclamation. *אבא ושלומא על כלה ארעה דמצרין*. But how he could draw this out of the present Hebrew Text, is to me inconceivable. For in the first place he must have considered the syllable *רך* as an useless adjunct, and either not found or suppressed, in his text, the word *אמרו*. Then, indeed, the Hebrew might be thus literally rendered: *Pater, et datus* (i. e. *constitutus*) *super omnem terram Egypti*.—On the other hand, according to some commentators, *רך* denotes a king; and consequently *אברך* signifies the king’s father; as if Joseph had, by this proclamation, been declared to be the father or guide of Pharaoh.—So it was understood by *Onkelos*: *אבא למלכא דין* *This is a father to the king*:

king: and from Jarhi we learn that כר in Syriac is a *king*. But it is not clear that either in Syr. or Chald. it had that meaning before Syria and Palestine were Roman provinces. The Thalmudists seem to have borrowed their כר or רכא from the Latin *rege*, the ablative of *rex*; or from *rex* itself, by the apocopé of *s*, of which and *k* the *x* is composed. This to me appears the more credible, as I find them elsewhere making the same apocopé in words derived from the Greek and Latin: thus אכר for αγκ, קליב *chalybs*, ידך *Judex*.—Jonathan understood כר in its common acceptation, *tener, tenellus; tender, delicate*; and this interpretation pleased a Rab. Judah (apud Jarhi*); and was adopted by Jerom, in his Q. Hebr. where he thus writes: “Mibi videtur non tam *præco*, sive *adgeniculatio*, quæ in salutando vel adorando Joseph accipi potest, intelligenda: quam illud quod Hebræi tradunt, dicentes *patrem tenerum* et hoc sermone transferri: AB quippe dicitur *pater*; RECH *delicatus*, sive *tenerrimus*; significante Scripturâ, quod juxta *prudentiam* quidem *pater* omnium fuerit; sed juxta *ætatem tenerrimus adolescens et puer*.” This is precisely the language of the Thargums רב בחכמה ורכך בשנים: “In wisdom great, although a child in years.” But this shews that the good Jerom was sometimes led into *childish* explanations by his Rabbinical tutors, against his own more critical judgment. On the whole, then, we must hold to the Coptic derivation of אברך, or say that it is here a Chaldaism for דברך, in which case it will signify *Bend the knee*. Or, perhaps, even in its present form, it might be plausibly explained *I bend the knee*, metaphorically *I bless*, or *salute*: as in French or Italian *Je vous baise la main; Vi baccio la mano; I kiss your hand*; by way of mere salutation.

Ver. 45. *And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-Paaneah*. That Joseph's new name would be Egyptian, there can be no doubt; but it may here again be questioned, whether the Hebrew historian might not accommodate that name to his own language. The Hebrew terms are צפנת-פנעא in the present Jewish copies †; and צפנתרפנעא in the Samaritan copies ‡.—Are these Hebrew or Egyptian words? The Jewish writers, in general, considered them as Hebrew; and render them by terms that mean *the discoverer of secrets*. Thus Onkelos גברא דשמך גלך ליה *the man to whom secrets are revealed*. To the same purport Jonathan and both Arabs; and Josephus in his interpretation of the name ||.—Syr. PerL and Gr. Ven. retain the original word; which in the last is thus written Σαφνῶθ Παανῆα; and in Syr. explained to be *one to whom secrets are discovered*.—The Latin Vulg. only, has *salvatorem mundi* (the saviour of the world) which Jerom in Q. Hebr. thus defends: “Licet Hebraicè hoc nomen absconditorum reperi-
torem sonet; tamen, quia ab Ægyptio ponitur, ipsius linguæ debet habere rationem: interpretatur ergo, sermone Ægyptio, *salvator mundi*; eo quod orbem terræ ab imminente famis excidio liberârit.” This interpretation was adopted by the generality of Rom. Catholic commentators; but as generally rejected by those of the Protestant communions. It has, however, lately been brought into credit again; as we shall see in the sequel.—But let us first

* For which, however, he was laughed at, by another Jew of Damascus. “Dixit ei filius Durmaskith: Quousque tu nobis detorques scripturas? non notat אברך נלך אברך *genus*; quoniam omnes ingrediebantur sub illius (Josephi) potestate.” † There is some small variety in the mss. One has פנעא for פנעא, one has פנעא in two words: one has פנעא פנעא; and one has פנעא—all probably erroneous. ‡ Three mss. have צפנת without a *jod* after פ; and this I consider as the better reading. || Σαφνῶθ γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα ΚΡΗΤΙΤΩΝ ἘΡΕΤΗΝ. Antiq. l. 2. c. 6. So Theodoret: ἀποφύγων ἐρμηνεύει; and Chrysost. τῶν κρυπτῶν γινώσκων.

notice the singular reading of the Septuagint, *Υπομνηστικῆς* *. It is remarkable, that, in this name only they have changed into *psi* the Hebrew *tsade*; which every where else they express by *sigma*. This inclines me to believe, that they had in view the Egyptian or Coptic term: which, residing at Alexandria, they might readily learn: if, indeed, the Coptic were not their ordinary language.

This being premised, let us now see what can be said in favour of, or against, each of the above opinions.—There are two strong arguments, in my apprehension, against the opinion of those who deem the words pure Hebrew, and render them *the revealer of hidden things*. For in the first place *פַּעֲנָה* is not Hebrew; at least it occurs no where else in the whole Hebrew Scripture; nor is it found in any other sister dialect. 2dly, Were it supposed to be an Hebrew word, and to signify *a revealer*; and that the preceding word *צִפְנֹת* meant *secret* or *hidden things*; which may readily be granted: yet still the construction would not be Hebrew; and in order to make of it a genuine Hebraism, the words must be transposed, and written thus *פַּעֲנָה צִפְנֹת*, or *פַּעֲנָה מַצְפֵּי*: as Gen. 37. 19. *בַּעַל הַחֲלוֹמֹת* *a master of dreams*; not *a dream-monger*, as we say in English: and Ps. 7. 10. *בּוֹחַ בְּרוּחַ לִבָּת* *searcher of hearts*, not *heart-searcher*.—In like manner, not to go out of the Pentateuch, *בְּיָמֶיךָ* Gen. 35. 18. *נִלְעַד* Gen. 31. 47. *אֲדֹלֵיבְסָא* Gen. 36. 4. *יִתְמַר* Exod. 6. 23. *אֲדֹלֵאב* Exod. 31. 6. *בְּלָעָם* Num. 22. 5.—Some compound proper names beginning with *אֲדָמִי*, *אֲדָמִי*, *אֲדָמִי* and *אֲדָמִי* are not to be accounted exceptions, as they are formed after a different manner, and are in reality reducible to the general rule.—Could I at all believe the name given to Joseph to be Hebrew, or rather by the Jewish historian converted into Hebrew; I would give the preference to the Sam. reading *צִפְנֹתִי פַּעֲנָה*, and render it with the Sam. translator *כִּי־נִרְאָה לִּי בְּחִזְיוֹנִי* *what was bidden from me be bath revealed*, i. e. “interpreted my prophetic dreams!”—Here the construction would be regular, as well as the mode of nomination: and *פַּעֲנָה* might be a quadriliteral, like *סִדְמָה*, from the Arabic *فَعَّ*, *aperuit, pandit*.

But still I am much more inclined to believe the word, or words, pure Egyptian or Coptic; and that in Coptic the meaning is to be sought.—Forster, in the Work already quoted, makes it a compound of *SACH-PNOUTI-PA-ENEH-ICH*; which he renders *The divine scribe of the eternal Spirit*: as fanciful and far-fetched an etymology, in my idea, as ever was imagined.—Bernard, in his very learned note on Josephus†, thinks that the original Coptic name was *PSOTHOUMOPONER*: which he explains: *Arcaum ille mihi reclusit*; which exactly coincides with the Sam. reading, as I have above understood and rendered it: and this coincidence is the more remarkable, as Bernard seems not to have known that reading, or not to have attended to it.—Jablonski, in his Letter to Michaëlis‡, writes the name thus: *PSOTEMPHENEH*||; and renders it *Salvator mundi*; the same meaning that Jerom had long before learned from the Egyptians themselves.—This is, undoubtedly, the most specious and most probable interpretation, that has yet been given; and I see no great cause for fishing in Coptic glossaries for another signification: although I have still some doubt, whether this even be the true resolution of the Hebrew word:

* There are 8 or 9 various readings in Holmes; but of very little importance: except that in 1 ms. as in Copt. the word terminates with *κ* instead of *χ*; and that one ms. (75) has an additional interpretation similar to that of Vulg. *δ εστιν ουσια αποκρυφτου*. † Antiq. L. 2. c. 6. ‡ In the 9th tome of *Oriental Library*, p. 202. || Compounded of *s* the article, *soi*, a favour; and *emphenen*, the genitive of *enn aiwy*, age, world.

and perhaps some one, more deeply versed in Coptic literature than I, may yet find a more suitable etymon. I have sometimes thought it might be compounded of $\sigma\sigma\delta$, *prudence*, and $\phi\eta\eta\epsilon\upsilon$, *abundare, abundans*, an epithet perfectly suitable to Joseph; but I fear it is not according to the rules of Coptic composition, and lay no stress upon it.—I had almost forgotten to observe, that Scholtz * writes the Coptic name of Joseph thus: *Thophentepheneb*; or *Jophentepheneb*; but gives neither translation, nor resolution of its component parts.—The reader who is curious to see more on this subject may consult the above quoted writers, Montfaucon's note in his Hexapla, Rosenmüller's *Scholia* in Genes. and the 16th ch. of J. Gregorie's Observations.

Ib. *Potipharos*. פוֹתִיפָר. Sep. Πετεφρ: but 8 mss. have Πετεφρη or Πετεφρι; and this I take to be the genuine reading: for $\phi\eta\eta\epsilon\upsilon$ in Coptic, signifies *the priest*, and $\rho\eta\eta\upsilon\sigma$ *the king*. He was the king or chief of the Egyptian priests. It was common with the Hebrew writers to drop a *nun* out of words which they Hebraized; and even out of their own words, for the sake of abbreviation.

Ib. After *the priest of On*, there is, in the present Heb. and Sam. Text וַיֵּצֵא יוֹסֵף מִצִּיֹּן *And Joseph went out over the land of Egypt* †; and this addition, with some small variety, is in all the antient versions, save Sep. ‡ Yet I cannot think that it stood here originally: so singularly awkward is its position: for it connects not with what precedes, nor with what follows. I have therefore rejected it among the Various Readings; as a probable interpolation.

Ver. 56. The clause which I have marked as wanting in Sep. is in 5 of Holmes's mss.

C H A P. XLII.

Ver. 1. *WHY gaze ye at one another?* לָמָּה תִּרְאוּ. I prefer this to the Sam. תִּרְאוּ (the *jod* is wanting in 1 ms.) which, however, was the reading of Syr. Jonathan, and the Perfic translator. The other antient interpreters read as we do; although they seem, at first sight, to convey another meaning. Sep. $\iota\sigma\tau\iota\ \rho\alpha\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. Onk. תִּרְאוּ. Saad. תִּרְאוּ. Vulg. *Quare negligitis. Why this delay? why look ye idly at one another?* "Solent enim (says rightly Rosenmüller) se invicem aspicere, qui in aliqua re moras neclunt." Gr. Ven. $\tau\omega\ \chi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\ \delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon\sigma\ \epsilon\iota$. Arab. Erp. $\tau\omega\ \chi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\ \delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon\sigma\ \epsilon\iota$.

Ver. 10. The words *to him*, said in my Var. R. to be wanting in Sep. are found in only one of Holmes's mss.

Ver. 30. *And took us for spies, &c.* וַתִּקַּח אֶתָּנוּ כְּמַגִּילִים lit. *et dedit nos ut exploratores*. The Septuagint either read or understood the word במַגִּילִים *in custodia*, after אֶתָּנוּ; as they render $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\circ\ \eta\mu\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$ (3 mss. $\epsilon\upsilon\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$): and, indeed this reading has much more of the Hebrew idiom than the present: whatever pains Glaffius and others have taken to defend it. I am, even now, convinced that it was the original reading: and am sorry that I neglected

* In his Coptic Grammar, p. 3. published by Woide in 1778. † Some mss. בְּלִל מִן; and Syr. Arab. and some copies of Onk. read either בְּלִל or בְּלִל מִן: but De Rossi mistakes when he classes Sep. with them. ‡ It is found in 3 of Holmes's mss. but these, I suspect, have been retouched on the Hebrew. They are numbered 15. 82.

it when I made my Translation, which I wish to be thus rectified: "*and put us † in prison*], as *"spies."*

Ver. 11. *True men.* Sep. and Vulg. *pacific.* Better Aquila *εῖροι, upright, fair-dealing, honest.* Sym. *ἀπλοί.*

Ver. 15. *By the life of Pharaoh.* פֶּרֶאָה בְּחַיָּוִת This oath in Egypt was nearly as tremendous and as common, as אֱלֹהֵינוּ among the Israelites. Joseph would not here swear by the latter; as that might have betrayed him.

Ver. 32. I preferred the reading of Vulg. *one father*, partly on account of the parallel place, ver. 13. and partly because *our father* sounds oddly in English. I would not, however, affirm that אֲבִירִי is not the genuine reading; or that even the author of the Vulg. read otherwise in his copy; as his *uno patre geniti* may be only a paraphrase. Thus Houbigant, Dathe, and Michaëlis, render as the Vulg. although they read אֲבִירִי in their copies.—The former uses the very words of Vulg. Dathe: *fratres unius patris.* Michaëlis: "*brüder, die einen vater hatten.*"—In Holmes's Var. Read. I find that the Slavonic Ostrog. version has also *patris unius.*

Ver. 37. *Both my sons.* אֶת שְׁנֵי בָנַי. In ch. 46. 9. we read that Reuben had four sons, and these are said to have come with Jacob into Egypt. They must then have been born in the interval between this colloquy and Jacob's migration: or we must understand the words "*went down with Jacob,*" in ch. 46. 9. 26. to be spoken proleptically: and this is the more probable, as the sons of Benjamin, to the number of *ten*, are likewise reckoned among the progeny of Jacob, who went with him into Egypt.

C H A P. XLIII.

Ver. 11. *PALM-HONEY.* So in my version I have rendered the Hebrew word דְּבַשׁ; after Bochart and Celsius. I am now convinced, that it is the *inspissated juice of the grape*: still called at Aleppo by the same name *dibs*, דִּבְס. "It has much the appearance of coarse honey, but is of a finer consistence.—It is much used by the inhabitants of *Aleppo*; is brought to town in great goat-skins, and retailed in small quantities in the bazars." Ruffel's *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 82.—See other authorities in Rosenmüller. In truth, neither common honey nor palm-honey could have been considered as a rare gift to a governor of Egypt, where palms and bees were so abundant: whereas raisin-honey, or a syrup made out of the grapes, which grew not in Egypt, might be deemed even a royal present.

Ver. 14. *But if I be bereaved, &c.* So Sophocles, Œd. Tyr. 1471. Αλλ' ἢ μὲν κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 27. Although, in my version, I have rendered this verse agreeably to the reading of the present Hebrew; I am now fully convinced, that the Sam. reading אֲנִי without the interrogative ׀ is the genuine lection: and that the version should be: "*Is your father, the old man whom you mentioned as being still alive, well?*" This reading must have been that of the Septuagint. For although the editors of the London Polyglott and of the Alexandrian ms. and Bos in his edition of the Vat. copy, have pointed thus the words: *πρεσβυτης, ὃν εἶπατε; εἰ ζῇ;* and although Dr. Holmes has followed this vitious punctuation in his new edition of the Septuagint: it is certain that the Roman edition of Sixtus Quintus reads and points thus: *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. εἰ*

ζῇ.

ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ πρῶτος ὁ πρῶτος, ὃν ἐπικατέ, ἐτι ζῆ. On what authority, or for what reason, the London editors and Bos changed this punctuation, I know not; unless it were to force the Septuagint reading to speak the Hebrew reading; which after all it does in a most awkward manner. The Complutensian edition has the same reading (except that with a great number of MSS. it has πρῶτος for πρῶτος) and is thus very properly pointed: ὁ πρῶτος, ὃν ἐπικατέ, ἐτι ζῆ;—But perhaps the Aldine edition has a still better reading, ὃν ἐπικατέ ἐτι ζῆ; which is confirmed by not less than 21 of Holmes's MSS. and Caten. Nicet.—Two MSS. have in the same sense ὅτι ζῆ, instead of ἐτι ζῆ; and one has ὅτι ἐτι ζῆ.—All these readings, when rightly pointed, are of the same import; and the only real difference is, that the reading ζῆ has more of the Hebraism, and ζῆ more of the Greek idiom. Houbigant has elegantly rendered the passage: “Recténe est, inquit, patri vestro seni, quem superstitem esse mihi dixistis?”

C H A P. XLIV.

Ver. 5. I CANNOT but here agree with Dr. Kennicott, that the Greek * has happily preserved the words that are now wanting in both Heb. and Sam. but without which the text is lame; and must have been unintelligible to those to whom the speech was addressed †. But I cannot so readily subscribe to what the good Doctor says afterwards; namely, that there seems no authority in the original for “considering the cup *used* by Joseph for *divination*.” For I cannot think that the words כִּי יִחַשׁ נִחַשׁ נִחַשׁ can ever be rendered “Therefore he would certainly discover concerning it.”—The words cannot, in my opinion, be better rendered than they are by Sep. αὐτός δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ. Vulg. *in quo augurari solet*; and so equivalently most of the ancient versions; even Gr. Ven.—Any other interpretation would, most probably, have never been thought of, but for the purpose of freeing Joseph from the imputation of practising augury. But who will affirm, that Joseph may not have practised augury in Egypt; or, at least, made his steward address his brethren according to the prejudices of the country? The Mosaic law against divination was not yet promulgated. I allow, however, that the Hebrew will bear another interpretation; viz. *Ipse autem divinatione divinitus est de eo* ‡; that is, “he has found out by divination that ye have stolen it.” But this will not exculpate Joseph from the imputation of real, or pretended, divination, any more than the former version; and, indeed he calls himself an eminent diviner, v. 15.—That a cup, σκῆπτρον ||, was used in the sacred rites of Egypt, we learn from Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. p. 633. ed. Sylburg. And Lucian, somewhere, rallies the Egyptians for making a divinity of ποτήριον §. The Greeks likewise drew omens and auguries from their sacred libations. See Le Clerc's very judicious note on this passage.

* He should have added Syr. and Vulg.

† “Sermones abrupti sunt (says Rosenmüller after Dathe) quoniam præsupponitur fratri Josephi facile intellecturos esse, quid sibi velit procurator.” If they did, they must have had an uncommonly quick apprehension. For what enigma is this? “Wherefore have ye rewarded evil for good? Is it not *is* in which my lord drinketh?”

‡ Noldius has given many examples in which the prepositive *de* has the meaning of *de*; *of*, *concerning*, &c. But the most of them are resolvable into another signification, and none of them in a construction similar to the present.

§ The person who carried it in procession was called σκαλιστής.

(in tabula) is represented with a cup in her hand.

Ver. 18. The speech of Judah, in this and the following verses, is in my opinion the most simple, and at the same time the most persuasive, piece of oratory that ever came from the lips of man. I have been in the habit of admiring it these forty years: yet my admiration increases every time I read it. Let my readers, who have not attended to its beauties, compare it with the phalerated harangue which Josephus substitutes for it, in his second book of Antiquities, c. vi. sect. 8. or with Steele's attempt to modernise it in one of his Tatlers*, and then say, if there be not as great a difference between them as between pure gold and glancing tinsel.

C H A P. XLV.

Ver. 1. *COULD not refrain himself, &c.* So Orestes, in Sophocles, 1180. at the moving speech of Electra: Φω! φω! κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 7. The Hebrew words לְחַיֵּיתָם לָכֶם לְפָנַי נִרְדָּה are in Sep. thus rendered: *εὐχόμενοι ὑμῶν† καταλείψιν μεγαλῆν*, which might lead one to imagine that they must have read differently, and this was once my suspicion: I now believe they had the same reading before them, but gave the phrase an equipollent turn: as Jerom has done in his version: *et escas ad vivendum habere possitis*: which is still farther from the literal meaning of the Hebrew.

Ver. 10. *Thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, &c.* This is in ch. 47. 11. called the land of *Rameses*: but what particular region of Egypt it was, has been much disputed. That it was a country fit for pasturage, and on the eastern border of Egypt, is clear from the context: but it is not so clear what was then the eastern border of Egypt, or what were the western limits of the land of Goshen. The antient translators throw little light on the subject, as they all retain the Hebrew word; save Saadias, who for Goshen has גֹּשֶׁן. But in no description of Egypt have I found any such name. Stephanus has indeed a Σαδαλις, which he calls an Egyptian town: and which may have been the same with *Sadir*; for in the Arabic and Greek languages the letters *l* and *r* were interchangeable: but still the situation of *Sadalis* is as uncertain as that of *Sadir*. Perhaps, when that part of Egypt which borders on Arabia is better known, such a name or its vestiges may yet be found.—The Greek Alexandrian translators, who must have been acquainted with the geography of Egypt, have Γεσημ† Αραβίας: and it was this which partly induced Michaëlis to place *Goshen* on the side of Arabia. He thinks it extended from *Raphia* on the border of Palestine, to the vicinity of Heliopolis. To this opinion I willingly accede; but I would not carry the northern boundary farther than the *Tirbonis palus*, and extend the southern boundary as far as *Mons Troicus*.—With respect to the name itself, I am inclined to think that the reading of Sep. Γεσημ, גשם, is the original reading: which the latter Jews Chaldaized into גשן, or גשן||. Were it certain, as I think it highly probable, that this part of Egypt were favoured with heavenly showers§; I should have little hesitation in affirming that גשם is the true reading. The *land of Geshem* would then be very properly denominated:

* See a sensible remark on this subject in *Commentaries and Essays*, vol. i. p. 279.

† Compl. and 4 mss. have

ὑμῶν. ‡ Only one ms. has Γεσημ. The Latin copies before Jerom had also *Geshem*. See the next note but one.

|| None of the oriental versions have the word written with a *vau*, although the punctators have, from Hebrew analogy, inserted a *bolem* or some equivalent vowel-point.

§ See Harmer, vol. 4. p. 354, &c.

namely a *land of rain* *; in contradistinction to the rest of Egypt, which was watered by the Nile: and this *land of rain* was a proper habitation for the Israelites, who were shepherds, and not agriculturists: It is remarkable that Heliodorus calls at least a part of this tract *βουβαλιον* or places fit for pasturage.

Ib. *That thou mayest be near to me, &c.* Whether Memphis, or Tanis, or, as I once thought, Heliopolis, were then the capital and royal city of Egypt, the land of Goshen might well be said to be nigh to it, as in all probability the pasturage ground reached, or very nearly reached, to the most eastern branch of the Nile on the north, and perhaps to On, or Heliopolis, on the south. Comp. Exod. i. 22. Besides the word *near*, which might be rendered *nearer*, may be understood comparatively, with respect to the far greater distance of Chanaan.

Ver. 18. *The best of all the land of Egypt.* That is, the most proper for you, as shepherds: not the most fertile part of the country, as is generally supposed. *Better* and *worse* are relative terms: and what would have been the *worst* of the land for Egyptian farmers, was the *best* for the nomadical Israelites.

Ver. 19. *This, also, thou hast my command to bid them do.* The present Text runs thus: עָשָׂה לָךְ וְלָאֲנָשִׁים וְלָאֲנָשִׁים, rendered by Pagninus "Et tu iussus es: hoc facite;" and by our English translators: "Now thou art commanded, this do ye." I very much doubt of the propriety of this phraseology and punctuation. The Septuagint seem to have read in their copy אַתָּה or אַתָּא, and to have considered אַתָּא as governed by it: Συ δε ενταυτα ταυτα λαβειν αυτοις † κ.τ.λ. The same reading, or perhaps אַתָּא, seems to have been that of Syr. and the Thargumists: so also equivalently, although more briefly, the Latin Vulg. "Præcipe etiam, ut tollant plaustra, &c.—The Sam. copy reads אַתָּא without any variety of lection; and if it had also read אַתָּא for אַתָּא, I should have been inclined to deem this the genuine text "Lo! I command: this do ye, &c." Perhaps the original reading was אַתָּא; which is equivalent to אַתָּא or אַתָּא; and which may have been the reading which Sep. found in their copy.—At any rate, the meaning is fully expressed in my version; and as literally as the idiom of our language permits.

Ver. 26. *His heart palpitated.* לִבּוֹ עָלָה. The common rendering is "his heart fainted." Sep. עָלָה עַל הַדִּמְיוֹנָא. ||.—Onk. Saad. and Perf. have terms that denote *hesitation*; no improper idea of Jacob's case.—Michælis: "Sein herz blieb aber kalt," *friguit cor ejus*; a meaning adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller; supported by the Syr. version; and from a meaning which עָלָה has in the Syr. and Arabic dialects. But I cannot think that the news of Joseph's being alive would *chill* the heart of Jacob. He might doubt, he might hesitate: but he could not be cold. I am persuaded, then, that the signification of עָלָה is to be sought in the Arabic عَالَم, which gives the very meaning wanted; namely that of *sudden motion, palpitation*. Not badly, therefore, the Vulgate: "Quasi de gravi somno *evigilatus*; tamen non credebatur eis."

* Jerom saw this, although the etymology did not please him; because, prepossessed in favour of his Hebrew, he deemed the reading of Sep. an error. "Hic (says he, Q. Hebr.) *Arabia* additum est: in Hebræis enim voluminibus non habetur: unde et error increbuit, quod terra *Gessen* in Arabia sit. Porro si, ut in nostris codicibus est, per extremum = scribitur GESEM (quod mihi nequaquam placet) terram signat completam. GESEM enim in imbre = vertitur."

† Five mss. have אַתָּא: 4 have אַתָּא: 1 has אַתָּא: and 1 אַתָּא.

‡ Compl. and 17 mss.

have אַתָּא: || Alex. and 8 mss. have אַתָּא.

C H A P. XLVI.

Ver. 21. I HAVE said in Expl. N. that there is much confusion in the various genealogies from Benjamin. I have made some feeble attempts to reconcile them, at least in some respects, in my Critical Rem. on 1 Chron. 26. 38. I shall at present only observe that the ten names here mentioned are not probably the immediate sons of Benjamin: and perhaps the order in Sep. is preferable to that in the Hebrew. — I now only desire that *Abi* and *Rosh* may be joined by a hyphen; as I believe them to be but one person.

Ver. 27. The addition in the Septuagint of *five* more persons, than are in the Hebrew, has been considered as an interpolation from Chronicles; chiefly, I believe, on the authority of Jerom; whose reasoning on the subject is, however, not very just*. On the other hand, it has been defended on the authority of Luke, as if Luke, or rather Stephen, *an inspired evangelist*, or *protomartyr*, could not be wrong in his supputation. But this is in itself a feeble argument; and thus refuted by the same Jerom: “Quod si e contrario nobis opponitur, quomodo, in Actibus Apostolorum, in concione Stephani dicatur apud populum, *Septuaginta quinque animas ingressas esse Egyptum*; facilis excusatio est. Non enim debuit S. Lucas, qui ipsius historiarum scriptor est, in gentes Actuum Apostolorum volumen emittens, contrarium aliquod scribere adversus eam Scripturam quæ jam fuerat gentibus divulgata: et utique majoris opinionis, illo dumtaxat tempore, Septuaginta interpretum habebatur authoritas, quam Lucas, qui ignotus et vilis, et non magnæ fidei in nationibus ducebatur.” Yet even here the father’s reasoning is more specious than solid. For the question is not, whether Luke quoted the Sep. or not: but whether Stephen in his speech to the Jews used that version. If he used the Sep. version, in speaking to Palestine Jews, it is a strong presumption that its computation was then acknowledged to be right: and indeed, I see not why it may not be here as right, as the Hebrew computation is with respect to the sons of Benjamin: for surely we must admit a *prolepsis* with regard to them also; unless we affirm that they were born before Jacob went into Egypt.

Ver. 28. *To make him meet him in Goshen.* The present Hebrew Text has לָרֹאשׁ לְפָנָיו וְשָׁמָּה; which Pagninus renders *ad præparandum ante se Goshen*: and our translators “to direct his face unto Goshen:” and still more literally Ainsworth, “to signify before him unto Goshen.” — The Sam. reading is not לְקָרְאוֹת, as Rosenmüller has it; but לְרֹאשׁוֹ, which was also the reading of the Syr. translator’s copy; and perhaps that of Sep. and Onk. although they rendered not so literally. Michaëlis imagined, from the version of Sep. συναντησάτωσαν αὐτῶν, that they read לְקָרְאוֹת, and is not unwilling to deem this the true reading: but to see one another being equivalent to meet, they might have read with Sam. which, with Houbigant and Dathe, I have followed in my version.

* See Q. Hebr. vol. ii. p. 543.

† Eight mss. have לְרֹאשׁוֹ; 4 have לְרֹאשׁוֹ, and 6 have לְרֹאשׁוֹ.

C H A P. XLVII.

Ver. 12. *IN proportion to the number of their families.* לִפְיֵי הָרָאשִׁים, *ad os parvuli.* Sep. κατὰ σῶμα *. *Vulg. singulis.* Dathe: *pro numero capitum.* We might say, *according to the number of mouths.*

Ver. 21. *And the people be reduced into servitude.* I follow the Sam. lection דַּעֲבֹד אֹתוֹ לַעֲבָדִים. Sep. τὸν λαὸν κατεδούλωσάτο αὐτῷ † εἰς παιδᾶς. *Vulg. subjecitque eam Pharaoni, et cunctos populos ejus ‡.*—I have no hesitation in preferring this reading, which the context seems to require, to the present Hebr. דַּעֲבֹד אֹתוֹ לְעָרִים *be removed them to cities.* See Houbigant's Prolegomena and Notes; and what has been urged against him by Ravius.—See also an excellent Note in *Commentaries and Essays*, vol. 1. p. 280.

Ver. 31. *And Israel bowed himself, leaning on his staff.* What thanks are not due to the Septuagint, for preserving here, as in many other places, the true sense of the original! The Text runs thus וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל רֹאשׁ הַמֶּטֶחַ, which is commonly rendered: "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." *Vulg. Adoravit Israel Deum, conversus ad lectuli caput;* or as Jerom more briefly in Q. Heb. *Adoravit Israel ad caput lectuli;* on which he comments thus: "Quod scilicet, postquam ei juraverat filius, securus de petitione quam rogaverat, adoravit Deum contra caput lectuli sui. Sanctus, quippe, et Deo deditus vir, oppressus senectute, sic habebat lectulum positum, ut ipse jacentis habitus absque ulla difficultate ad orationem esset paratus."—And this sort of reasoning has been adopted by most modern interpreters. Yet it is all a pure begging of the question. For it is not said that Jacob was in bed, or even indisposed, when he sent for Joseph. His last sickness is only announced in the next chapter. Nor is it at all probable that the adoration paid to Joseph || was made in bed: the word יִשְׁתָּחוּ admits not such a position. Whereas an old feeble man making an obeysance on the top of his patriarchal staff, or *scapula* הַמֶּטֶחַ, is quite natural; and no translator could better express the meaning of the whole comma than the Septuagint have done. Καὶ προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρον τῆς ῥαβδου αὐτου. Every word of the original is in favour of this version; and nothing against it but a different mode of pointing the word הַמֶּטֶחַ.

C H A P. XLVIII.

Ver. 12. *THEY bowed themselves.* So the Sam. וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ, and so Sep. προσεκύνησαν, and Syr. סִכְרוּ; a more probable reading than the present Text וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ, and justly preferred by Michaëlis and Dathe, whose version of the whole verse is: *Tum recedere eos paululum jubet Josephus, ut submisce avum venerarentur.*—After the young lads have received their grandfather's benediction, Joseph withdraws them from between Jacob's knees, and makes them pay their reverence to him. The other versions read in the sing. and consequently apply the term to Joseph.

* Gr. Ven. literally κατὰ σῶμα το ῥητις.

† Compl. with 8 mss. εἰς αὐτῶν.

‡ The other versions and

Josephus read as the present Hebr. and are followed by Dathe and Michaëlis.

is another *petitio principii*.

|| For that it was paid to God;

Ver. 15. *The God who hath tended me.* As a shepherd tends his flocks, וְהָאֱלֹהִים דִּרְעָה אִמִּי. So the Psalmist, 23. 1. "The Lord is my shepherd."—Mankind are wont to borrow their metaphors chiefly from their own professions. Hence so many allusions in the Hebrew writings to a pastoral life.

Ver. 19. *But the younger shall be greater, &c.* It is justly remarked by Rosenmüller, that this *prophetical benediction* (as he calls it) was not fulfilled in the time of Moses: as in the two musters made by him the tribe of Manasseh was considerably more numerous than that of Ephraim. It must therefore be referred either to the times of the Judges, when the tribe of Ephraim seems to have rivalled, in some sort, the tribe of Judah; or to the days of Rehoboam, when they became the commanding tribe of the other ten, which then separated themselves from the house of David.—The division of the Manassehites into two half tribes, might also contribute to the inferiority of both.

Ver. 22. *One portion.* שְׂכֵם אֶחָד. Some interpreters, among whom is Michaëlis, make this portion to be the place of *Sichem*, which Jacob's sons destroyed on account of the rape of their sister: and which might be denominated a *conquest* with respect to Jacob. Against this it has been objected, 1mo. That it is not probable that Jacob would call this a just conquest, since he every where else abominates the deed of his sons. 2do. That *Sichem* belonged not to the *Amorites*, but to the *Hevites*.—Neither of these objections is formidable. For, in the first place, although Jacob disapproved of the fraud and violence of Simeon and Levi, he might still consider *Sichem* as a conquest. He most certainly winked at his son's proceedings; and seems to have been more solicitous about his own safety, than concerned for the slaughter of the *Sichemites*. See ch. 35. 30. And he had surely as good a claim to the ground where *Sichem* stood, as he had to the "herds and flocks, the little ones and the wives" of its inhabitants. Ib. v. 28. 29. As then we read of no other conquest made by Jacob, we have a right to suppose that this is that here alluded to: and we actually find *Sichem* and its environs a part of the inheritance of the *Josephites*. Notwithstanding all this, I would not with Michaëlis, and even on the authority of Sep*, (whom I am always loth to abandon) insert *Sichem* in the Text; because I am persuaded that שְׂכֵם is here not a proper name, but an appellative noun, whether we derive it from the Arab. שִׁכְם *a gift*, or the Hebr. שִׁכְם *a shoulder*. Yet still, I think, it alludes to *Sichem*; to a part of which Jacob had a fair claim by purchase, ch. 34. 19.—and where the bones of Joseph were interred, Josh. 24. 32.—As to the objection arising from the name of *Amorites*, we know that this was a much more extensive name than that of *Hevites*, and might include the latter. If this satisfy not; we must suppose that, after the flight of Jacob from *Sichem*, some *Amorites* tribe took possession of the place, and were afterwards expelled by Jacob: although we no where read of that expulsion. See my Explanatory Note.

* Εγώ δε δίδωμι σοι Σικίμα, εξαίρετον ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.—Better Gr. Ven. Εγώ δ' ἔδωκα σοι μερίδα μίαν, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

C H A P. XLIX.

ALTHOUGH this chapter has had more commentators than perhaps any other single portion of Hebrew Scripture, it must be confessed that it has not hitherto been illustrated so satisfactorily, as to exclude further elucidation. In these Remarks I shall less indulge myself in criticising my predecessors, than in endeavouring to defend my own Version : which I have made, regardless of system, and, I think, devoid of every sort of prejudice. But, first of all, I must declare that I do not believe it to be the real composition of Jacob, but of some Hebrew bard, who lived posterior to Joshua, perhaps posterior to David. That Jacob may have blessed his children, and accommodated his respective benedictions to the known bent and disposition of each, is highly probable : but that he should accord his benedictions to the future situation of the tribes, will not readily be believed by those who have critically and philosophically examined the subject*.

Ver. 3. There is no difficulty, or dispute, with respect to the first comma : but the second, which I render "the prime of my might," is in the Latin Vulg. "*principium doloris mei,*" *the beginning of my sorrow*. But this rendering has been abandoned by most interpreters ; and is indeed unsuitable to the context. Syr. Chald. Perf. Ar. Erp. and Gr. Ven. all took מַנְיָא for *strength*. And Sep. has equivalently, though figuratively, אַרְחָי תַּעֲזָוָה לִּי מוֹן. Jacob was in the vigour of his life, when he begot Reuben : and to this all the epithets evidently allude. The next colon מִן מַנְיָא שָׂאָה רֵעוּבֵן is still more variously interpreted. Sep. σκληρος φερσθαι, και σκληρος αυδαης : a meaning of which, in my apprehension, the Hebrew words are not susceptible.—Vulg. "prior in donis, major in imperio ;" and so Matthew "chief in receiving, and chief in power," *i. e.* the chief portion of his father's goods, and the chief dominion among his brethren : and this I take to be the virtual meaning of the words ; although not their literal import : "superior in dignity, superior in power," for this last word is here more proper than *strength* ; which stands in my Version. Most of the Ant. interpreters coincide in this meaning : although some of them are too wild paraphrases, particularly Onkelos and the Targums. The sense is not badly expressed by Gr. Ven. περισσους του αιδου, περισσους τε κραταιων.

Ver. 4. *Like water, thou hast lapsed*. In the preceding verse Jacob expresses in strong terms what Reuben was, or should have been by nature and birth : in the present he paints his degraded condition, and the cause of it, in lively colours. The present Text reads thus פָּחוּ כֶסֶם מִן מַנְיָא : but with Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, Durell, &c. I prefer the Sam. read. פָּחוּת, which was that of almost all the Ant. interpreters ; although they considerably differ in its meaning. Sep. Effusus es, Vulg. "Effusus es," and so equivalently Syr. Onk. Perf. which, I have no doubt, is the genuine meaning. All Reuben's former preeminence lapsed away like

* "Non probabile est, carmen hoc iisdem verbis, quibus in hoc capite continetur, coram filiis recitatum esse a Jacobo moribundo. Sine dubio unus filiorum Jacobi, aut alius quidam, summam eorum, quæ prædixerat senex Jacobus, in carminis hujus formam redegit, ut hujus prædictionis memoria in posteros perflaret ; atque ipsi horum dictorum memoriam recitatione recolere possent." Schultze in locum.—This is granting much ; but, in my opinion, not enough. See J. H. Heinrichs *De Auctore atque Ætate Capituli Genf. xlii.* Gotting. 1790.

† Compl. and 2 mss. תַּעֲזָוָה.

be suitable to the context—except Gr. Ven. who certainly read *דק*, and literally renders it *ἐκαστοτον*.—The Sam. reading *דק* then appears, to me, to be the true reading. The verb *דק* in Chaldee signifies to *make a diligent review*, to *suppute with accuracy*; in a word, to *muster*; and it seems to have a similar meaning in both the Syr. and Arab. dialects.

Ib. *His tried domestics*. *את דכר ילדי ביתו*. It is not easy to ascertain the radical meaning of *דק*. It occurs but 18 times, in any form, in Hebrew Scripture; and, in most of these places, signifies to *initiate*, or some such term. Nor is that signification here inept. Abram's domestics were *initiated* in the art of war; *tried* and *expert* in the use of arms. The ancient versions vary in their renderings, but they may be mostly reconciled to this meaning. Sep. indeed, has *דכר*: but I suspect this word has here a peculiar meaning, and signifies somewhat more than *suos* or *proprios*. It may have the same meaning with *ιδανος*, or the Latin *idoneos*; of which, perhaps, it is the root. Be that as it may, the Latin Vulg. has *expeditos*, no improper term. Onkelos and Jonathan have a word, that is commonly rendered *juvenes*: but which I take to mean more than that; namely *juvenes, adultos, fortes, ad ministerium aptos*; youths of a superior sort, robust expert young men*; or, as Jonathan well explains it, *עלמ' דדק לקרבא*, youths, whom he had trained to war†. To the same purport Saadias, *נצחיה*, his trusty ones. Arab. *Erp. צבאנה* (from *צבא*) his military. Perf. *דמכרין* ministers. In fine, the Greek of Venice has the very word we want, *επακιδωτους αυτου*.—So that, whatever be the radical meaning of the word, which I take to be *habena, a bridle*: not a bridle like our modern bridles: but a cord, halter, or *hank*‡ tied about the heads of animals to train them to duty. Hence metaphorically, to train up men to any profession.

Ver. 18. *Melchizedek, the king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine*. It is hardly conceivable that this passage, so simple, and readily understood, should have given rise to one of the most violent controversies between the Protestants and the Romanists. The latter would have it that the bread and wine, brought forth by Melchizedek, were not for the refreshment of Abram and his associates; but a real sacrifice offered to God, and an early type of the sacrifice of the Mass §. The Protestants, on the other hand, could see nothing of all this in the text, and indeed they had good reason: although the Catholics had the fathers, even Jerom himself, on their side. The reader, who chooses to see how the controversy was carried on, may consult Bellarmine, Whitaker, Martin on the Douay Bible, Mercerus, Amama, &c. It is but just to observe, that several of the most learned Catholics even then gave up the point; such as Cajetan, Andradius, Oleaster: and now I believe there is hardly one who would seriously defend it. “Ideo (says Houbigant) Melchisedech sacerdos Dei altissimi nuncupatur, quia benedixit Abrahamo; non quia panem et vinum protulit.—Ita rem accepit Paulus in Ep. ad Hebræos.” See Josephus, Ant. l. i. c. 10. n. 2.

Ib. *Priest of God the supreme*. Although I have thus translated, according to the import of the word *עליק*, it would, perhaps, have been more proper to leave the word untranslated *the*

* See Buxtorf, Lex. Chald.

† The Targum of Jerusalem has *מכרין*: but Buxtorf shews that this is an error: and that the true reading is *מכרין*; which denotes more than mere domestics, it denotes *special select well instructed servants*.

‡ This appears to me to be the very original word.

§ Their argument was drawn from the Vulgate version: which runs thus: “At vero Melchisedech rex Salem, proferens panem et vinum, erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi, benedixit ei,” &c. The stress was laid on the word *enim*: which indeed should have been *autem* or *et*. So Sep. *דק דע יפאוס*: and so all the other versions.

God Elion; as I have little doubt of that being the name of Melchizedek's God, and probably of the people whose king he was; for he was, like Virgil's Annus, both king and priest, according to the usage of antient times.

Ver. 19. *He blessed Abram*. I have omitted, it appears, to mark among my Various Readings that the word *Abram* is added on the authority of Sam. and Sep.*

Ver. 24. *Aner*. אָנֶר. The Sam. copy has here and in ver. 13. Anram אַנְרָם, and Sep. has אַנְרָם †. That *Aner* is the true reading appears from Josephus; who has Ἐνραπος.

C H A P. XV.

Ver. 1. *IN a vision*. Sep. Ald. and one of Holmes's mss. add *νυκτός*, of the night.

1b. *And very great shall be thy reward*. וְשֶׁכֶרְךָ הָרַבָּה מְאֹד. I add the *van* on the authority of 9 Sam. mss. Vulg. and Armen.—The Sam. copy instead of *וְשֶׁכֶרְךָ* has *אֲרַבָּה*, “I will make thy reward exceeding great,” a reading of the same import, and almost equally probable.—That a translator from the Latin Vulgate, unacquainted with or inattentive to the original, should thus render: “I am thy protector and thy reward exceeding great,” is not very strange, as the ambiguity of the Latin phrase admits that meaning; and so the Douay translator renders it: but that our last English translators should have fallen into that mistake, is not so easily accounted for; especially as they had not only the Septuagint and other antient versions, but prior English translations to point out the right road. But they implicitly followed the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles; and retained not, even in the margin, the better rendering of Tyndal, and Cranmer's Bible.—Even the Latin Vulg. itself, when properly pointed, is susceptible of the true meaning. “Ego protector tuus: et merces tua magna nimis:” *erit* being understood.

Ver. 2. *Lord, God!* The present Text has *אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה*, *My lord the Lord*; or *My lord Jehovah*. I preferred the reading of Vulg. Syr. Onk. and 4 mss. which have *יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים*. But when I so translated, I had not seen Dr. Holmes's Various Readings of the Septuagint; nor, at that moment, considered the impropriety of putting *יְהוָה* in the mouth of Abram, to whom, if we believe the Lord himself speaking to Moses ‡, the term was not known. I am now fully convinced, that the true original reading was, either simply *אֲדֹנִי* *my lord*; or *אֲדֹנִי אֱלֹהִים* *my lord God*. It is true, the Septuagint have *Δεσποτὰ Κυρά* in all the printed editions, save that of Alcalá: but *Kyρά* is wanting not only in this edition, but in not less than 24 of Holmes's mss. and in the antient Coptic version. Nor was it read by Philo, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Gennadius: and, what is still more remarkable, it is wanting in the Greek of Venice; which has only *δεσποτὰς* *me*. All this is in favour of *אֲדֹנִי* only.—Yet I am more inclined to think that *אֲדֹנִי אֱלֹהִים* *my lord God* is the genuine reading: and this reading may have been that which Jerom and the Syriac translator found in their copies: for the words *Domine*, סִרְיָא, are used by them to express *אֲדֹנִי* as well as *יְהוָה* §. With respect to *אֱלֹהִים*, it was read not only by Jerom, Syr. and Onk. but also by both Arabs. Tharg. and Perf.; and is in one of Kenni-

* That is, of Sep. Vat. Ald. and Alex. for 4 of Holmes's mss. have *αυτον*. And 1 ms. with Ed. Compl. have *αυτον* *Μελχισεδεκ*.
 † Compl. only has *Avap*; not, as Holmes has it, *Avpa*. He was not here misled by Bos, who quotes rightly.
 ‡ Exod. 6. 3.
 § See ch. 18. 3, 27, 30.

eott's mss. without either מֶלֶךְ or מֶלֶךְ. I desire my version to be corrected thus: *My lord God.*

Ib. *And he, to whom I must leave all, is that Damascus, Eleazer.* מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ. This is a very difficult passage, and has given much trouble to commentators. The great desideratum is to ascertain the true meaning of the word מֶלֶךְ, which occurs but thrice in the Bible *, and begets obscurity every time it occurs: nor is it certain that in each of these places it is derived from the same root: and, indeed, the sense that might suit one passage, can hardly be made to suit another †. Here, therefore, we must be contented with collecting what rays of light we can from the context and the antient versions. In the most antient of these, the word is considered as a proper name, and the passage rendered thus: ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μωσὲν τῆς οικουμένης μου, οὗτος Δαμασκός Ἐλεάζαρ ‡. They supposed *Masek*, or *Mefek*, to be one of Abram's female domestics, whose son was destined to be his heir, in case he should have no children. The other Greek versions, supposed to be those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, are υἱὸς τοῦ ποτιζόντος—συγγενὴς—καὶ πατήρ all vague conjectures. Onk. בֶּר פֶּרְסָא, and Tharg. בֶּר פֶּרְסָא. *filius sustentationis*, the man who provides for the house; and so equivalently Perf. and Arab. Erp. Vulg. *filius procuratoris*. Sam. version, בֶּר מְדַבֵּר *the man of business*, the *steward*. Saadiah מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ *ipse regens*, to the same purport.—The Syriac translator either found not מֶלֶךְ in his copy, or omitted to render it.—Finally, the Greek of Venice has this remarkable reading, υἱὸς τῆς ἀρεσκείας; which may be rendered *the son of election*: and if I could find in any of the oriental dialects a similar meaning in any of the following roots מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶךְ or מֶלֶךְ, I should without much hesitation prefer this version to all others.—But the truth is, all the antient translators seem to have made the best conjectures they could: and, perhaps, the Syrian did better to leave the word out altogether, than give it an uncertain meaning.

Let us now see how modern critics have disposed of it.—Those who derive the word from מֶלֶךְ, render it *filius cursitationis*, *the son of cursitation*: a proper appellation, say they, for a *steward*; who is constantly *running about* in the discharge of his duty.—Others derive it from the Arab. مَلِك, which signifies *to arrange*, or *set things in order*. Hence מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ will be *the son of order*; or chief ruler of the house.—Others, making מֶלֶךְ itself the root, and finding one signification of that word, in Arabic, to be *properare*, *to hasten*, imagine that מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ may denote *vir properus et diligens*; a *diligent steward*, who goes *expeditiously* about his affairs.—Others, supposing that מֶלֶךְ signifies *to leave*, interpret מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ *filius relictionis*; i. e. he to whom the inheritance is *to be left*.—Although I am far from thinking, that this signification of the word is unquestionable, I have adopted it in my version; as the most agreeable to the context: for it seems clear from the tenor of Abram's speech, and the order of the Hebrew words, that מֶלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ signify something synonymous to an *heir*.—I once thought the true meaning of the word מֶלֶךְ might be found in the Æthiopic *Sbuk*; which denotes the *stay* or *support* of a house. This would certainly make a good sense here: but as it has no such meaning in any of the other sister dialects, I durst not admit it into my translation. I have taken no notice of Schul-tens's *peclinare*; because I think it an absurd derivation. On the whole, it is better to confess one's ignorance, than to affirm for certain, what is but barely probable.

* Namely, 1f. 33. 4. and Zophan. 2. 9. and here.

† See c. 2. on the respective places.

‡ The various readings, in Holmes, are here of no importance.

Ver. 6. *Who accounted it to him for righteousness.* ויחשבה לו צדקה; which Sep. and, from them, St. Paul render καὶ ελογώθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, *It was accounted to him, &c.* So also passively, Vulg. *reputatum est illi ad justitiam* *. I, with Arab. Perf. Tharg. Pagninus, Castalio, and our common version, take the word actively; and have rendered accordingly. The meaning is well expressed by Saadiah כתבדא לה חסנה, *he ascribed it to him, a good deed.* He numbered it among the other tests of his piety and religion.—This text has been a subject of much warm altercation between the Popish and Protestant controversialists: in which the latter, in my opinion, were fairly worsted.

Ver. 9. *An heifer of three years, &c.* עגלה בשלש. Sep. δαμαλιν τριετιζουσαν. Vulg. *vaccam triennem*: and so all the antient versions, save Onk. and Perf. which, instead of a *three years old heifer*, have a *triple-heifer*, or *three heifers* †. And this is the interpretation of Sol. Ben Jarhi, D. Kimbi, and other Jewish commentators. “The Hebrew word משלש, says Delgado, means *threefold*, as in Eccles. 4. 12. I do not know who informed the English translator, that they [the heifer, the goat, and ram] were to be three years old, rather than three months or three weeks.” I will tell him who informed the English translator, and every other translator, who renders as he doth.—The Septuagint, who certainly knew the purport of the word better than Jarhi, Kimhi, or Delgado—the learned Jew Josephus, who renders in the same manner—the Syr. and both Arabs, who were all well acquainted with the idiom of the Hebrew language—the Thargum of Jonathan, who expressly renders עגלה ברית שלש—and the Text of Isaiah 15. 5. where עגלה שלשה cannot, certainly, mean *three heifers*, but one *full grown heifer of three years*: as the Thargum on that place well renders it.—But עגלה שלשה in Eccles. is a *triple cord*. True; but it is only *one cord*, composed of *three plies*, just as the heifer's age is made up of *three years*. The משלש of Ezek. 42. 6. is to be understood in the same manner; a building of *three stories*. The animals here mentioned are, at three years, in the prime of their life, and then reputed perfectly fit for victims ‡.

Ver. 13. *Will reduce them into slavery.* Our translators, following the reading of the present Text, render “and shall serve them.” But, as Delgado well observes, the nominative here must be the people of the land in which they are to be strangers, and the pronoun *them* אֹרְכֵם must refer to the *seed of Abram*. He thinks that עבדום is here עבדו בהם *they shall serve themselves with them*. Why not rather ויעבדום; which, I have no doubt, was the original reading? Sep. δούλωσαν αὐτούς. Vulg. *Subjicient eos servituti*. Arab. يستعبدونهم *shall enslave them*. They all read in *Hebhel*, or the coöctive voice. And so equipollently, Syr. and the Thargums.

Ver. 15. *Shall have been buried in a good old age.* תקבר בשיבה טובה. Sep. τραπεζης ἢ ἐν γῆρι || καλῶ: a very early corruption, since it is in both the Italic and Coptic versions; and what is

* So also Syr. and Onk. as translated in the Polyglott: but that translation, I think, is wrong; and both, as well as Tharg. should be rendered actively. The Gr. of Ven. renders passively λελογισται αὐτῷ δι δικαιοσύνης. † So also Gr. Ven. δαμαλιν τριετην.

‡ I cannot here refrain from transcribing the excellent observation of Rosenmüller. “Ratio autem cur Dens animalia trima esse voluerit, sine dubio hæc fuit, quia tali ætate hæc animalia in pleno robore et vigore ætatis sunt. Chrysostom. Hom. 26. in Genes. τριετιζοντα λαβεῖν προσεταξε, τὸν ἑστὶ, τελεία ἀγχιρισμένα. Sic apud Lucian. in Deorum Dialogis, Ganymedes a Jove raptus, et demitti petens, pro αὐτῷ suo promittit se Jovi immolaturum arietem τὸν τριετην, τοῦ μαγαν, ὃς ἡγείται πρὸς τὴν τομην.” § Three mss. have τραπεζης.

|| Nineteen mss. have γῆρι.

very remarkable not one of Holmes's mss. has the true reading of Compl. ταφης. Excellent is the version of Aquila, ταφης εν πολλοις αγγελος. So also Gr. Ven. ταφης η τ' αγγελος. Χρησι.

Ver. 18, 19. On the boundaries of Judæa, and every question relative to the geography of that country, I shall copiously treat in my General Preface.

C H A P. XVI.

Ver. 12. "THIS verse (says Delgado) in the English translation is not intelligible:"—a strange assertion. To me it is perfectly intelligible: and to every one, I presume, it will appear more intelligible than that which he would substitute: "His hand shall be *in all*; and the hand of all shall be *in him*."—The version of Schulze, though not literal, is elegant and expressive: "omnium adversarius, ab omnibus vicissim infestabitur."

Ib. *In the face of all his brethren*, &c. The word *brother* in Hebrew denotes every kind of relation. By the mother's side, her Egyptian relations were his brothers; by the father's side, the posterity of Abraham. To both the Ishmaelites were conterminous. Hence his residence is said to be *in the face of all his brethren*, על פני כל אחיו.—Dathe thinks the words על פני should be rendered *ab oriente*, *to the east* of all his brethren. I doubt, if the words will bear such a version.

Ver. 13. *The visible God*, &c. This is a very difficult passage, which various attempts have been made to elucidate. The present Hebrew runs thus, ותקרא שם דעה ודבר אליה אלה אלה אל ראי, which our translators render: "And she called the name of the Lord, that spake unto her, Thou God 'seest me.'" Le Clerc and Houbigant consider *ראי, not as the participle *benoni*; but as a verbal noun, and render *Tu es Deus visionis*; i. e. *visibilis*. So Michaëlis: "Du bist der 'Gott des sehens.'" I understand ראי or ראה in the same sense; but I divide the words thus †ראי את דאל ראי; making את the usual mark of the accusative, and ה the prefix to אל. I know not if Dathe so divided; but he has rendered as if he had. "Vocavit Jovam cum ea colloquenter, *Deum visionis*."—This arrangement, and this translation, are evidently more agreeable to the context; and have more of the Hebrew idiom in them than the present reading, and common rendering of the words.—But all the difficulty is not yet got over. The following words, explicative of the former, have, in my opinion, been generally misunderstood. They run thus in the Text: כי אמרה: הנה הלא ראיתי אחרי ראי which in our vulgar translation is rendered: "For she said: Have I also here looked after him that seeth me?" which version if any one understand, I shall admire his acuteness. The Latin Vulgate has at least an intelligible rendering: "Dixit enim: Profectò, hinc vidi posteriora videntis me ‡." He had, no doubt, in view a passage in Exod. 33. 23. where God is represented as shewing his *back only* to Moses. The Septuagint either read not or disregarded אחרי, unless we suppose that they expressed it by εωρων; which is not at all improbable: for אחרי and אחרי not only signify *behind*, but *beside*, *by*. And the Coptic version seems to have so understood the Greek. In this, then, I agree with them; and have willingly adopted their version, but interrogatively. Καί

* The Sam. copy has ראה, which perhaps is the better reading.

† Contrary, however, to all the ancient

versions, who read אחרי in one word.

‡ Thus Englished by the Douay translators: "For she said: Verily here

"have I seen the backe parts of him that hath seen me."

γενεσιων [μου] ειδον σφραγισται μου. I have added μου in brackets, because I suspect it was originally in Sep. as it is still in the Copt. and in one of Holmes's Arab. mss.

Ver. 14. *Wherefore the well was called The well of the visible God.* Lit. the well of the God of vision. I have here indulged an emendation partly conjectural. The present Text is: באר ראי לדי, which our translators, in the margin, render "The well of him that liveth and seeth me." So the Latin Vulg. "Puteum viventis et videntis me."—The version of Sep. at first sight seems strange: φραση, ον ενωπιον ειδον. They seem to have again read אוראי instead of לדי; and to have understood אלודם God: "The well where I saw God beside me." This is not amiss: but it does not entirely satisfy me. I presume then, that the true reading is באר אלודי ראי *The well of the visible God*: conformable to verse 13.—Cui hæc displiceant, is meliora inveniat.

C H A P. XVII.

Ver. 1. *GOD the omnipotent.* Although I have preferred this appellation; I am not quite sure that it is the real meaning of the Hebrew word שדי: which some derive from the Chald. שדא to *shed*; because God *sheds* his bounties on man: and this is certainly no improper or improbable derivation. The *all-sufficient* of the Arab. version is applicable to both attributes. The derivation of שדי from שדד is highly improbable. The Lord would not assume, at any time, a name that better suits *him* who is called the *destroyer*; much less at a time when he is encouraging his servant to look for his protection and favour. Ikenius, indeed, has endeavoured to shew that שדד, in Arabic at least, signifies, *powerful, strong*: and in this sense it will be synonymous with *omnipotent*.—Michælis thought שדי came from the Arab. سد to *mount up*: and is equivalent to *επουρανος*.—It is observable that the word either was not read at all, by Sep. or that they omitted to render it. They have only *εγω ημει δ θεος σου*. Is it probable that they read אלהיך? The Gr. of Venice has *εγω θεος ο κρατατος*.

Ver. 13. *Born in thy house, or purchased with thy money.* This distinction of slaves is clearly marked in Sophocles, *Oed. Tyr.* ver. 1143. *ην δουλος. κ. τ. λ.*—So our Chaucer: "Thine owne square, and eke thine owne born-man."

Ver. 14. It is rather odd, that the addition in Sep. "on the eighth day" is not found wanting in any one of Holmes's mss. This, with Sam. copy, is much in favour of that reading.

Ver. 15. *Sarai—Sara.* I have said in my explanatory note that *Sarai*, or rather *Sari*, appears to me to signify a *star*. My reasons are, 1. The prior name of *Sara*, namely *Sarai* or *Sari*, was most probably given to her in Syria: now סרי in Syriac signifies a *star*. 2. We learn from the book of Job, chap. 42. ver. 14. that it was usual in the East to give to beautiful women the names of stars. *Sarai* then was the *Astoria* or *Stella* of her day. At least, this is a much more probable etymon, than either the common one, which makes *Sarai* signify *My lady*, a title which, I believe, is unknown among the Orientalists; or Michælis's *colocynth*, which we can hardly suppose could ever be the name of the beautiful *Sara*. With respect to this latter new name I cannot but agree with Ikenius, that it is derived from the Arab. سرام, which denotes *fecundity*. The objection of Michælis to this etymon, from the *eliph*, in Arab., having a *hamza*, is a pitiful objection: there existed no hamzas in the days of Abraham.

Ver. 16. *Whom I will also blest.* וברכתו. So Sam. Sep. and Syr. which I prefer to the present tautological reading ברכתה.

C H A P. XVIII.

Ver. 8. *CREAM*. חמאה. So Rashi explains it. שֶׁן חֵמֶלֶךְ *The fat of the milk*. I am not however certain, but it may rather mean that sort of acid milk which the heat coagulates, and which is exceedingly cooling in the summer season. That it was in some degree a potable liquid, is clear from Jud. 5. 25. where Jaël presents it to Siserah, to quench his thirst. Abraham, then, brought to his guests either *cream* and *simple milk*, or *sour* and *sweet milk*: which mixt together, make, even in our climate, a very palatable dish.

Ver. 10. *According to the time of life*. כַּעַת חַיָּה. Sep. κατὰ καιρὸν τούτων εἰς ὥρας. Vulg. *Tempore isto, vita comite*: and similar guess-work is in all the antient versions. The best of those conjectures appears, to me, that of the Persic זמן וזמן חמור *Justa tempus factus*. This is, I think, the true meaning. See my explanatory note.

Ver. 19. *For I know*, &c. The present Hebrew has, *I know him*, יָדַעְתִּי, which Houbigant renders *ego providi de eo*; and Michaëlis: "Ich habe ihn zum freunde erwählt;" *I have chosen him for a friend, that he may*, &c. This interpretation is adopted by Schulze and Rosenmüller: *Eum enim amicum elegi, ut præcipiat*, &c. "By this rendering (say they) the affix *vau* is expressed, which it is not by the common translation; and לָמַעַן retains its ordinary and proper "acceptation." The former of these reasonings is weakened by the Sam. lection יָדַעְתִּי, without the affix; which was read by none of the antient versions, save Perf. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven.—There seems to be more force in the latter reasoning, which is chiefly insisted on by Houbigant: "Neque aliam sententiam capit לָמַעַן אֵשֶׁר, in quo adverbio causa est rei futuræ, "non autem nuda ejus expositio." So, indeed, the Erpenian Arab. seems to have understood his Text לֵאמֹר אֵשֶׁר אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם בְּסֵבֶב אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם: and it must be confessed that the general meaning of לָמַעַן, with or without אֵשֶׁר, is *because, to the end that*; nor have I found a single passage, but the present one, in which it can well be otherwise rendered. The verb יָדַע has certainly a wider signification than merely to *know*. It often signifies to *acknowledge, approve, superintend*: and it may have some such meaning here; especially if the present reading יָדַעְתִּי be accounted the genuine one. But if the other reading, יָדַעְתִּי, which has for it the authority of Sam. Sep. Syr. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. and Arab. Pol. then I think we must give to לָמַעַן אֵשֶׁר an uncommon meaning, and render, with the forementioned translators, as I have done. So Dathe: "Novi enim, "eum præcepturum esse filiis suis et posteris suis, ut instituta mea servant," &c.—For the rest, the word *Abraham*, which I have inserted from Sam. is also, I now find, the reading of 3 mss. of Sep. and was read by Chrysostom in his copy.

Ver. 20, 21. What scholar, on reading these verses, does not immediately call to mind these beautiful lines of Ovid:

Contigerat nostras infamia temporis aures;
Quam cupiens falsam, summo delabor Olympo,
Et Deus, humana lustro sub imagine terras.

C H A P. XIX.

Ver. 11. *THEY smote with such blindness.* דָּבַר בְּטוֹרִים. Sep. *ἐκταλαῖαν ἐν σκοτεινίαι **. The Hebrew word, which occurs only here, seems to me to be a compound from the Arab. *سنا* which signifies a *flash*, and of *אור* *light*. The blindness then was caused by a flash † of lightning; and might be only temporary. The Greek version is susceptible of this meaning. The French version of Geneva is not improper: “*Ils frapperent d’éblouissement.*”

Ver. 14. *Who had married his daughters,* לָקַח בָּנוֹתָיו, which is commonly rendered *had betrothed his daughters*. But it is *אָרַשׁ*, not *לָקַח* that signifies *to betroth*: and the Sep. have well rendered the latter by *τοὺς υἱοθετοῦσας ‡*. This relates to other daughters of Lot, than those after mentioned, ver. 15. who are said to be those two only who were then *present* with him.

Ver. 16. *As he still lingered.* וַיִּתְמַחֵם. The Sep. seem to have read some other word; perhaps וַיִּתְמַחֵם from וַיִּתְמַח, which twice in the Psalms is rendered by the same Greek word which they use here, *ἐταραχθησαν § they were troubled*. Yet in Ps. 119. וַיִּתְמַחֵם is rendered, as here, *ἐταραχθη*. Had *ταραχτω* or *ταρασσω* ever such a meaning? Or is the Greek word here a corruption? I find no word in the language that could well be mistaken for it; at any rate, the Text and all the other versions have *lingered*, or something equivalent. Lot was loth to leave Sodom, which he had chosen for his residence; and where he had probably made connections.

Ver. 20. What I have rendered “*Is it not a small city?*” may signify “*Is it not a small boon which I ask?*” But the other seems to be the better translation.

Ver. 24. *When the Lord himself, &c.* Lit. *The Lord, from the Lord, &c.* יְהוָה מִיְהוָה. This Hebraism has been a source of much scholastic disputation. The great bulk of Christian Theologues have imagined that two divine persons are here mentioned. The first *Lord* is Jesus Christ, who was one of the three angels who appeared to Abraham; and is now one of the two who were sent to destroy Sodom and Gomorra; and who rains down from the second *Lord*, that is from his *father*, fire and brimstone on the Sodomites. It is rather astonishing, that even Houbigant and Michaëlis should have gone into this systematical reverie.—This is one bad consequence of servile translations. If the Greek and Latin versions had not literally rendered the original *Κυριος, παρὰ Κυριου*; *Dominus, a Domino*; we should most probably never have heard of distinction of persons. The Arabic translator seems well to have understood his Text; as he renders *עַדָּה מִן עַדָּה וַיִּתְמַח מִיְהוָה וַיִּתְמַח מִיְהוָה* *God rained from himself sulphureous flame, &c.*—Nothing is more common in the oriental languages, than to use the *noun* for the *pronoun*: and this indeed seems to be the language of nature. A child is not apt to say of himself, *I am a good boy*; but *Billy good boy*; or of his sister, *Thou art a naughty girl*, but *Sally naughty girl*: and it is with some difficulty that he is made to understand, that *I* means himself, and *thou* the person to whom he speaks. A few examples from Scripture will, I apprehend, settle this matter Gen. 2. 3. “*God blessed the seventh day, &c. because on it he ceased from all*

* Ald. and 53 mss. want the preposition *ἐν* which, however, I am persuaded stood originally in Sep.

† Or rather by repeated flashes, for the word is in the plural; and rendered by Gr. Ven. *ἐν ἀσπασίαις*.

‡ Most modern translators, however, follow the Vulgate: *qui accepturi erant*: and so Josephus understood the Text. The other versions are ambiguous.

§ The only variety of lection, worth remarking, is that of 3 Arab. mss. which read in the singular number.

“his works which *he* (the Text has *God*) had ordained to create.”—Exod. 16. 7. “Ye shall see the glory of the Lord, on his hearing your murmurings against *him*”—the Text has “against *the Lord*.”—Thus Josh. 9. 21. “Let them live, said the chiefs, as the *chiefs* (that is *we*) have promised to them,” &c.—1 Kings 2. 19. “Solomon caused a throne to be placed for the *king's* mother,” that is, for *his own* mother.

I cannot quit the destruction of Sodom, and the deliverance of Lot, without a most apt quotation from Rosenmüller. “Mirum in modum huic nostræ historiæ similis est ea quam Ovidius, lib. 8. Metam. de Philemone et Baucide narrat. Jupiter et Mercurius, ut hic duo angeli, inter homines humanâ formâ induti, iter faciunt—homines plane inhospitales offendunt, ut inter Sodomitas nulla hospitum reverentia fuit—unus tamen Philemon Diis peregrinantibus, ut Lotus angelis, hospitium præbuit. Tandem Jupiter et Mercurius deos se fatentur, pœnasque vicinis minantur, quod idem hic faciunt duo angeli—Dii Philemonem et Baucin eripiunt periculo, ut angeli Lotum et familiam—Servantur Philemon et Baucis domum relinquendo, atque in montem, præeuntibus Diis, fugiendo; quemadmodum Lotus et filia—Plectuntur, denique, vicini Philemonis et Baucidis, mutato in stagnum eorum oppido; uti vallis Siddim lacus facta est—

———*Tellus habitabilis olim,*

Nunc celebres mergis fulicisque palustribus undæ!

Ver. 26. To what I have said in my explanatory note, I have only to add, that some modern interpreters are of opinion that the *saline statue*, here mentioned, was a monument erected by posterity to the memory of Lot's wife. This appears to me highly improbable. The translation in my note is that of Dathe: “Uxor vero Loti, cum respiceret, in solo saluginoso hæret infixa.” He supposes that a ב may have dropt out of the text, before מלחה, from its contiguity to the ב at the end of נצב.

Verses 31, 32, 33. Mar-Ephræm puts a curious apology in the mouth of Lot's daughters, on their pregnancy being discovered. They very gravely tell him, that the young men of Sodom, to whom they had been betrothed, had found means to get into their apartments, and had violated them, anteriorly to their leaving that city. The good Lot believed them, and was satisfied.

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 16. *LO! I have given, &c.* This has been always considered as a very difficult passage; and I long despaired of making any tolerable sense of it. The present Text runs thus: רצה נתתי אלף כסף לאחדי חנה' הוא לך כסות עינים לכל אשר אתך' ואת כל ונכחת. which our translators render, “Behold, I have given thy brother a thousand *pieces* of silver: behold, he is to thee a covering of the eyes, unto all that *are* with thee, and with all *other*: thus she was reproved.” To me this literal version is unintelligible; and is one of the many proofs which can be adduced, that the present Hebrew Text is incapable of being translated into sense, without being first corrected. Now it luckily happens that it is here, in part, corrected

rected by the Sam. exemplar, 'וזה הוא לך כסות עינים' וכל אשר אתך. This was partly the reading of Sep. who seem well to have understood the first part of the passage, Ἰδοὺ δέδωκα χίλια δίδραγμα * τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου ταῦτα ἐξαι† σοι εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ προσώπου σου, καὶ πᾶσαι αὗται μετὰ σου καὶ πάντα ἀληθεύσου. The whole of this version is clear: only they seem to have refined on the words כסות עינים, which they render τιμὴν προσώπου *the honour of the face*, i. e. a precious veil. In the last comma they are not so happy: for how out of ואת הכל ותוכת, which is the Sam. reading, or even out of ואת כל ותכרת, which is the Hebrew reading, they could draw καὶ πάντα ἀληθεύσου, I cannot comprehend. They must have read, I think, ואת כל נרתו, which Syr. Vulg. Saad. and even the Thargums, also read; or suppressed the *vau* before נרתו. Yet still, how will these words produce either the meaning of Sep. *and tell nothing but truth*; or Jerom's *et quocumque perrexeris, memento te deprehensam*; or the wilder paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan? Houbigant, who often finds corruptions in the Text where they are not, here maintains its integrity. "Nihil mendi est in voce ותכרת. Nos, *ne te concupiscant: verbum pro verbo, nam concupiscibilis es, ob tuam pulchritudinem*; ex Arabico verbo, *ducere uxorem, uti uxore; vel ejus matrimonium ambire*." If poor Le Clerc had ventured such a version, he would have been roughly handled for it by the Oratorian. Indeed it is altogether unworthy of Houbigant.

Michaëlis's version of the whole passage appears to me little less exceptionable. He derives כסות from כס *numerare*, and renders עינים כסות *multa oculorum*; the *fine* which Abimelech paid for *looking* at Sara; and takes נכרת to be the sec. perf. fem. sing. of the active voice of נכת, which, he thinks, is well rendered by Sep. ἀλθυσεν. Then the לכל אשר אתך are to be disjoined from what precedes, and united to what follows; and hence will arise the following version: "Lo! I have given to thy brother a thousand shekels of silver, as an eye-fine: but to all who are with thee, tell all the truth." I wonder that such a version could be approved by Schulze and Rosenmüller. Michaëlis himself gives a much better one in his German translation: "Ich habe deinem bruder tausend seckel silbers zugestellet, für die kaufe einen ichleyer, und trage ihn überall, damit jedermann wisse, daß du verkeyrathet bist." So Dathe: "Dedi mille fidos argenteos fratri tuo, pro quibus velamen faciei tuæ emas, ut cum omnes qui tecum sunt, tum et alii, qui te viderint, intelligant te esse maritum." This free paraphrase is perfectly intelligible: but I cannot think it the true meaning of the original, which I will now endeavour to give. I follow the reading of the Sam. copy, without the elision of a single letter: I only change the *vau* before נכרת into a *be*||, which, from the great resemblance of the two letters in the antient character, may have by transcribers been readily mistaken for a *vau*. I next borrow from the Arabic the original meaning of נכת, which I believe to be *inire*; and ותכרת *femina inita*: one who is no more a virgin; or a *married person, maritata*. Then I think all will be clear, and the Text, thus divided and pointed, וזה נרתו, אלה כסף לאדוד' וזה הוא לך כסות עינים ולכ אשר אתך' ואת הכל ותכרת will give the following

* Compl. and Alex. have δίδραγμα (omitted by Holmes); and one ms. has δίδραγματα.

† One ms. has

αἰσῶν, but without σου.

‡ One of Holmes's uncial mss. has here a singular reading:—καὶ μετὰ ψευδὴ το

λῶν.

§ Making *me* the fem. pronoun.

|| I think this better than throwing out the letter altogether; although that would make no odds as to the signification of the sentence.

literal version: "Ecce dedi mille argenti *feclos* fratri tuo: ecce, hoc *argentum* tibi velaminis " oculorum *sit pretium*; et omni quæ tecum est; omni nempe maritalæ." This, I am persuaded, is the genuine reading, and true meaning of this passage.—*Viderint eruditi.*

C H A P. XXI.

Ver. 14. *A BOTTLE of water.* I have retained the word *bottle*, although, with us, it gives a different idea. The antient bottles were made of skins, and contained more or less, according to the size of the animals (commonly goats) out of whose skins they were made. They are still used in the East for carrying water and wine; and as they are carried on camels, equipoised on each side of the bearer, they are more convenient than any other: "Il vaut mieux avoir le vin et l'eau dans des peaux de chevres, lorsqu'on voyage dans les païs orientaux. Le poil des peaux, qui contiennent l'eau, est en dehors; au lieu que celui des peaux, qui contiennent le vin, est en dedans: et ces peaux sont si bien poissées, que la liqueur ne contracte pas le moindre mauvais goût." Niebuhr, *Voyage en Arabie*, vol. i. p. 171.

Ver. 19. *God opening her eyes*, &c. signifies only, according to the Hebrew phraseology, that she was fortunate enough to discover a well; which is no easy matter in those deserts, where wells are not plenteous, and are often so covered up as that none, but they who are acquainted with the places, can find them out.

Ver. 23. *My posterity.* In the Hebrew are two words, *לני ונכרי*, which are rendered by Sep. *σπέρμα μου* and *ὄνομα μου*, *my seed and my name*. Vulg. *posteris meis stirpique mea*. Syr. *בטורסי ובשרבתי*. Onk. *בברר ולבר ברי*, *to my son and son's son*: and so equivalently Jonathan. Perf. Arab. Erp. followed by Pagninus, our English translators, Le Clerc, Houbigant, and Dathe. But as the precise meaning of the original words * is not sufficiently ascertained, I have chosen to express them both by the word *posterity*. So Michaëlis: "Mit mir, und meinen nachkommen."

Ver. 27. *Took flocks and herds.* Houbigant here has committed an oversight: he renders, without any authority, *tulit septem agnos et bovem*.

Ver. 31. *Beer-sheba*, *באר שבע*. *Beer* signifies both an *oath* and *seven*. Probably the oath was repeated seven times, according to the number of lambs. We are told by Niebuhr, (*Description de l'Arabie*, p. 176.) that the Iman of Yemen confirmed his promise with *seven oaths*.

Ver. 33. *A tamarisk.* That *אשל*, Arab. *أشيل*, signifies a tamarisk, is clearly shewn by Celsius, Hierobotan. part i. p. 537. See also Michaëlis's *Supplementa ad Lex. Hebr.*

* *נכר* seems to signify a representative. *נ* posterity, *שבע*, of any degree. The Greek of Venice has for the last word *σπέρμα*.

C H A P. XXII.

Ver. 2. *THE land of Moria*, * אֶרֶץ מֹרְיָה. Sam. has מֹרְיָה; and this seems to have been the reading of Aquila, Symmachus, Jerom, and even of Sep. although they render it by ὁψηλην, as they had before rendered a similar word, ch. xii. 6. I am therefore inclined to think that this is the genuine reading; whether we consider the word as an *appellative* or a *proper name*. As an appellative, it might be rendered *the land of vision*; or, more properly, *a conspicuous land*, as Aquila renders τῆς γῆς καταφανῆς. The Syr. interpreter took it to be the *land of the Amorites*. Onkelos, Tharg. Bab.† and both Arabs, render the Hebrew word by words that denote *worship, adoration, service*, עֲבָדָה, פִּלְחוּתָא. Most singular is the rendering of Gr. Ven. τῆς γῆς Μορχιτῆς.—On the whole, I deemed it better, with our vulgar translation, Michaëlis and Dathe, to retain the original word, than to risk a doubtful meaning, at best, and perhaps a false one.

Ver. 13. *He saw beside him a ram*. I have said in my explanatory note, that “perhaps the Sam. Greek, and Syr. reading is the true one.” I write this in the full conviction that it is the true one, or at least a part of the true one; and that the word אֶחָד, in the present Text, is either a corruption or out of its place.—The change from אֶחָד to אֶחָד was easily made. This latter reading, however, must have been in Jerom’s copy, and in that of the Persian translator. But all the rest, ‡ from Sep. down to the Greek of Venice, read אֶחָד; and this is still the reading of forty-two Hebrew mss. of a very old edition without date, and of the ed. of Lisbon 1491, which, De Rossi observes, is very accurate, and rarely departs from the Masoretic readings. It is observable that Onk. and Saadiah seem to have had both lections in their Text, as the former has אֶחָד אֶחָד after אֶחָד; as if he had read אֶחָד after אֶחָד, and אֶחָד, where אֶחָד now stands, after אֶחָד. So Saadiah has אֶחָד אֶחָד in the same place and meaning.—If אֶחָד was ever in the Text, I would place it after אֶחָד and write, not אֶחָד, but אֶחָד *beside him*. In this supposition I have expressed, in my translation, the meaning of both words; for *a* before *ram* is equivalent to *one*. I might have rendered אֶחָד אֶחָד, more properly perhaps, *a single ram*; prevented from following the flock, by being entangled in *a thicket* of brambles, or some such shrub.

Ver. 14. *And Abraham called the name of that place JEVE-IRAE*, יְהוֹוֵה יִרְאֶה, which the Masoretes point thus יְהוֹוֵה יִרְאֶה, in our common translation *Jehovah-Jireh*. This is of little importance: But how are the words to be rendered? The Septuagint have Κυριος εἰδεν, (one ms. εἰδεν): the Latin Vulgate, *Dominus videt*: Syr. אֱלֹהֵימָא נָתַן *the Lord will provide*; or, as we sometimes say, *see to it*; and this, I doubt not, is the true meaning. The phrase evidently alludes to the answer of Abraham, ver. 8. “God will provide for himself a victim,” &c. It was so understood

* One of Kenn. mss. has מֹרְיָה, and the Persian translator must have read the word with a *vau*, as he has retained the very name so spelled.

† Tharg. Jerus. has מֹרְיָה לְשׁוֹן מֹרְיָה on Mount Moria: and some modern interpreters are of opinion that Mount Moria, on which Solomon’s Temple was built, is here proleptically to be understood. ‡ The word, indeed, is not expressed in either of the Arabs, probably because they deemed it an expletive: but it is fully expressed by Sep. and Gr. Ven. κυριος εἰς. Syr. and Jon. אֱלֹהֵימָא נָתַן. Onk. אֱלֹהֵימָא נָתַן. It is worth remarking, as corroborative of the Sam. reading, that there is a similar expression in Daniel viii. 3. “I raised mine eyes; when lo! I saw, standing by the river, *a ram*, אֶחָד אֶחָד.”

by Arab. Exp. who renders אלהים יראה; and still better by Gr. Ven. Ὁ Θεὸς οὐρανόθεν ὀφείλει *. It is strange that the Septuagint, who, in the verse just mentioned, had used the same word οὐρανόθεν, should have here used εὐρ and still more strange that, in the last colon of ver. 15. they should have rendered the same word passively ὁφείλει. Yet in this they have been followed by Pagninus and most modern translators, *In monte Dominus videbitur*. Some, among whom our last translators, put the word ראה in construction, and render, "In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen." What meaning they annexed to such a sentence I am at a loss to know. Delgado tried to mend it thus: "Concerning which place it will some day be said, In the mountain of the Lord, the Lord shall appear †." Houbigant seems to have been guided by a somewhat similar fancy. He imagines, that God here shewed to Abraham his son Jesus Christ, who was to be the future victim for the world: "and this is what Abraham consecrates to eternal memory, when he subjoins, *To-day in the mountain the Lord shall be seen: Hodie in monte Dominus videbitur*: illud hodie sic accipiens, ut accipit Paulus apostolus illud Davidis, *Hodie si vocem ejus audieritis*: quod hodie tamdiu durat, quamdiu sæcula illa durabunt, de quibus apostolus, *donec hodie cognominatur*. Propterea, Abraham non dicit, *Hodie Dominus videtur*. Nam id spectaculum nunc solus videt Abraham, postea omnes visuri sunt, et ad omnes pertinebit istud *videbitur*, generatim dictum, cum omnes unigenitum in monte viderint generis humani victimam factam. Nec aliam sententiam series verborum patitur. Ex qua serie illi deviant, qui hæc verba אלהים יראה משה Mosi sic narranti attribuunt; quasi renarret Moses usurpatum sua ætate proverbium. Nam, si sic erit, non jam docebit Abraham, cur huic loco nomen fecerit, *Dominus videbitur*, quam tamen nominum notationem in sacris paginis non omittunt ii, quicunque nomina rebus imponunt. Quod contra planè docebit Abraham, si de eo Moses sic narrat, *Vocavit nomen loci hujus, Deus videbitur: nam dixit, In monte Deus videbitur*."—I have given the whole passage in the words of the author, for the purpose of exhibiting one of the first biblical critics of the present age, supporting an insupportable version by a tissue of as bad reasoning as I have ever met with. He would have here done well to pay some attention to Le Clerc, who has very properly rendered the first comma, although he mistook the meaning of the second; which is justly rendered by Jerom ‡, Gr. Ven. §, and our translator Coverdale: "Upon the mountain shall [will] the Lord provide." For in this I agree with Houbigant that, in both commas, יראה should be pointed and rendered in the same manner; that is, not in the future passive, but in the future active.—I will just mention Dr. Kennicott's translation, for

* So also the Perfic translator. Onkelos, Jonathan and Saadiah have here wild conjectural paraphrases. How Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion rendered, we know not. † "It most likely refers (says he) to the Sche-

binah in the holy temple upon mount Zion, which is this very mountain. The word יומא means some day. See Job 1. 6. 13. and 2. 1. It can never mean, as the English translator renders it, *as it is said to this day*; for this was not said until David's time: so that we are not obliged to allow that an interpolation was made, in David's time, of these words, as Aben Ezra pretends." This is a rare way of getting rid of an interpolation. But, in truth, there is no necessity to say with Aben Ezra, that there is here any interpolation. It may be a part of the original narrative, whether written by Moses or any other person; or at any time posterior to the transaction recorded. An expression may become proverbial during the life-time, even, of him who first uttered it: but that is not a proof of the narrator's having lived soon after, or long after, that period. All that we can lawfully infer from the Text is, that these words, *In the mountain the Lord will provide*, had become a proverbial saying when the author wrote. ‡ *In monte Dominus videbitur*. § *Ex opes ὁ οὐρανός οφείλει*.

the sake of Secker's note on it. " Kennicott (says he) translates: *Because he had said, that day, On the mountain the Lord will provide*: but, then, I think it should have been אִשָּׁר, (not אִשָּׁר;) and I doubt whether דוֹם דוֹם singly do not always signify *this day*. The comma might be translated thus: *which is said at this day: On the mountain, &c.* or, *as it is said*: " for אִשָּׁר is sometimes put for אִשָּׁר. אִשָּׁר might be passive; but אִשָּׁר יִרְאֶה, ver. 8. directs " to the other sense."

C H A P. XXIII.

Ver. 1. I HAVE said, in my Explan. Note, that the parenthesis שָׁנֵי דַי שָׁנֵי for *so many years did Sara live*, is in all the ancient versions save Sep. and Vulg. I now find it is in 2 of Holmes's mss. one of which is in uncial letters. Still I am inclined to deem it an interpolation; or, perhaps, originally a marginal notice, which afterwards crept into the Text.

Ver. 2. The addition in Sam. and Sep. (*in the valley*) is marked with an obelos in one of Holmes's uncial mss.; and Jerom, Quæst. Hebr. says, " Hoc quod hic positum est, quæ est in " valle, in authenticis codicibus non habetur *."

Ver. 10. *Ephron, who was then sitting, &c.* So the late Bp. Law in his manuscript notes, and Ainsworth and Purver in their versions: and so, long before them, Sep. אֶפְרוֹחַ and indeed, equivalently, all the ancient versions, save Vulg. which has *habitabat, dwelt*; followed by James's translators, and retained by Bate.

C H A P. XXIV.

Ver. 4. *BUT that thou wilt go to my own country, &c.* כִּי אֶל אֶרֶץ. The Jewish interpreters tell us that כִּי is here for כִּי. But the Sam. copy and more than twenty mss. have כִּי אֶרֶץ, which, undoubtedly, is the true reading.

Ver. 9. *Under the thigh of his master Abraham.* תַּחַת יָד אֲבִרָם אֲדָמִי, where, according to some critics, אֲדָמִי is in the plural. I think not; but believe it to be in the singular, with the affix; as אֲדָמִי is often used; as if we were to say, *his my-lord; his my-father*.

Ver. 22. *A golden pendant.* נָזֶם דָּהָב. I have not translated נָזֶם by *ear-ring* or *nose-ring*, but rather by a more generical term which may suit both. And, indeed, I believe it to have been rather a jewel hanging by the nose, than in the nose. Hence it was well rendered by Symmachus *ερεπιδωρ*, as we learn from Jerom †, who adds, that although the other interpreters rendered it by *inaurem*, yet by that word is not meant ear-rings, properly so called, but circular pendants made in the form of ear-rings. " Non quò in aures ponantur in naribus, quæ ex eo " quod de auribus pendeant innaures vocantur: sed quò circulus in similitudinem factus in- " aurium, eodem vocabulo nuncupetur: et usque hodie inter cætera ornamenta mulierum, " solent aurei circuli in os ex fronte pendere, et imminere naribus." At this day the women

* Houbigant wrongly asserts, that the Complutenian edition has not the words in question. It has the very same reading as the other editions; *ἡ δὲ Σαρα ἐγενήθη ἑκατὸν ἑπτὰ ἔτη*. So also the Coptic version, and the Lat. Italic, in Aulim: and, indeed, I am much inclined to think that it was originally in the Hebrew Text; especially as it is still in the Samaritan copies.

† In Ezek. 16. 12. tom. iii. p. 790, ed. Ben.

of Arabia wear such pendants *. It is true that some women, particularly in Persia, wore rings in their noses, which for that purpose they pierced with a needle, as the curious reader may see in *Thevenot, Arviand, Michaut, Pietro de la Valle, Russel's Aleppo*, &c. Still I thought it better here to use a more general term, which might suit either, *face*, or *nose*, or *ear*.

Ver. 26. *The man fell down*. This, I now think, is not a just rendering. The common version, *he bowed down his head*, or rather, *he bowed his head*, seems better to express the meaning of פָּרַח; although by some of the ancient translators it was considered as equivalent to our *prostrate*. In my explanatory note, I have observed that the Septuagint seem to have read a different word, as they render ἀδοκμας †. I am now of opinion that they read as we do, but gave to the word a transitive meaning; and that their ἀδοκμας should be rendered, not *blissing*, but *being well pleased* ‡, which Abraham's servant shewed by an inclination of his head: as we say, *to nod assent, approbation, complacency*.

Ver. 30. The transposition of the words *Haran*, &c. is thus defended by Houbigant: "Hæc verba in versum rejicimus sequentem, eò quod hæc sequuntur *accidit autem, cum videret*, &c. quæ videre non potuit Laban, si jam foras exierat. Neque licet credere, Laban foras antea exiisse, quàm sorore ex sua didicisset ea, quæ versu 30. narrantur. Atque cum narrandi ordinem esse præposterum, docet illud פָּרַח, quod rerum seriem solet indicare in narrando talem, qualis fuit ipse ordo rerum gestarum."—Delgado has endeavoured to reconcile the present arrangement by rendering the verbs in the preter-perfect tense. "When he *had seen*—and *had heard*," &c. And so Dathe, *cum audisset*—et *vidisset*. But still this is awkward in English; and all is made clear by the transposition.

Ver. 32. *He brought the man*, &c. I have followed the reading of the Vulgate, which arises from a different pronounciation of the word אָבִי, which is here, I think with Dathe, in the *co-actives* voice. The other rendering, although that of almost all the versions, is not near so natural, nor so agreeable to the context. It may, however, be defended on this principle, that the Hebrew writers are not always so accurate in their connection of the various parts of a sentence, as that each verb has the same nominative.

Ver. 50. *Laban and Bethuel answered*. This is the first time that Bethuel is introduced. All had hitherto been transacted by Laban. Hence some have imagined that Bethuel, who is supposed to have been dead, is here an interpolation. I see no reason for such a supposition. He might be old and infirm, and consequently unable to perform himself the offices of hospitality, which he left to his more able and active son. His consent, however, was here necessary; and he is accordingly brought on the scene.—For the rest, it is well known that, in those countries, the brothers were at least as much the guardians of their unmarried sisters, as the father. See Michaëlis's *Mosaisches Recht*, part ii. sect. 83.

Ver. 55. *A year or ten months*. In the present Text, there is only עשר אֶחָד, *dies aut decem*, which makes no tolerable sense; although our English translators, by the aid of

* "Les femmes Arabes (says La Roque) portent une gaze brodée de sequins et d'autres pieces de monnoye d'or, qui pendent autour du front, et de deux cotés des joues." *Voyage dans la Palestine*, p. 219. See also p. 225.

† There is no variety of lection in Holmes's mss. save that the Slavonic of Moscow is supposed to have read αδογγαζαζ. Theodoret has οσσενας in a quotation which he makes in his books *on Providence*, vol. iv. p. 608, nov. ed.

‡ The Latin translation in Pol. Complut. is *complacens*; better than the *benedicens* in the London Polyglott.

an Italic eke, and straining the word עשר, have made out the following version: "Abide with us a few days, at the least ten." More literally, Coverdale: "Abide at the least ten days," from the Vulgate, *saltem decem dies*, and Sep. *ἡμέρας ὥσπερ δεκάς*. But, besides that אין no where else signifies either *saltem* or *ὥσπερ*, it is here placed in a situation that cannot admit such a rendering.—The Sam. copy has evidently a better reading, ימים או חדש *days*, (i. e. a whole year,) or a month. Yet the leap from a year to a month is so great that one is apt to suspect this reading also. Houbigant would retain the חדש of Sam. but place it before ימים, a month of days, that is, a complete month, as the same words are to be taken ch. 29. 14.; and it must be allowed that this is a most ingenious conjecture*; but as עשר, or עשר, is in all the Hebrew copies, and was read by all the antient translators, save Syr. I would rather say that the word חדש had been dropped out of the Hebrew Text, than that עשר had been soisted into it. From both Texts, then, we have perhaps the genuine lection, ימים או עשר חדש a year or ten months. Onkelos, Jonathan, and both Arabs. must have so read in their copies †. Both Dathe and Michaëlis have adopted this reading: *Annum, aut decem menses—Ein iahr, oder zehn monath.*

Ver. 60. *Mayst thou multiply into many thousands.* ודי לאלף רבבה. *Sis in millia multa.* Sep. *γὰρ εἰς χιλιάδας † μυριάδων*. *Vulg. crescas in mille millia.* And so most of the other antient versions, making רבבה some definite number. I think it means any very great indeterminate number, and have rendered it accordingly §.

Ver. 62. *Isaac had come from Beer-elohi-rui.* The present Hebr. Text runs thus: ויצאק בא מן הדרך ליד רוא *which in our common version is rendered, "And Isaac came from the way of the well Lahai-roi."*—The phrase בא מן הדרך *be had come from coming*, is an uncouth and uncommon expression. It is defended, however, by Aben-Ezra, Le Clerc, and others, who think it similar to the French *il venoit d'arriver*. Houbigant laughs at this explanation, not without some appearance of reason: yet most of the antient interpreters seem so to have read in their copies. Sep. alone follows the reading of Sam. במדבר בא *ἐν τῇ ἐρημῷ, be was walking by, or in, the desert, &c.* If מדבר were at all originally in the Text, I would say, that the prefix מ had been changed into ב; and that במדבר is the genuine lection. I am, however, more inclined to adopt Houbigant's correction; namely, that מרוא was originally מרע *¶*; or to read, with one of Kennicott's mss. מרוא without בא. Isaac dwelled at Beer-elohi-rui; but went to meet his bride at Hebron, where his father resided, and where his mother had died.

Ver. 63. *To muse.* וישל. Sep. *ἀδελανχῆσαι*. *Vulg. ad meditandum.* Onk. Tharg. Arab. Pers. have words that denote *to pray*; and even the Gr. of Venice has *προσευχῆσθαι*. The Syriac

* And seems to have been the reading which the Syr. translator had before him. † Even the Greek of Venice has *ἡμέρας καὶ δεκάμερον*: which is a proof that the translator either read חדש in his Hebrew copy, or understood it. Arab. Exp. who is a very literal translator, must have so read in his copy, for he has expressly עשרה ימים.

‡ Three mss. have *χιλιάς*. § Archbishop Secker remarks, in his manuscript notes, that when our translators make רבבה a determinate number, they elsewhere render it 10,000; but here, and Ezek. 16. 7. a million.

¶ Twenty-five mss. with Compl. and Alex. have *ἐρημῷ*. ¶ This conjecture receives some authority from a ms. which has מרוא עב: for how could the copyist have thought of inserting עב, if it had not been in his exemplar? De Rossi has no various reading: but his collation is only a partial one; and some of his mss. may possibly have some variation.

version has לַמַּלְאָכִים *to walk*: and this by some modern critics is supposed to be the true meaning of the Hebrew word. I see no reason to depart from the commonly received opinion. Schul- tens's derivation to me appears forced and unnatural. But the reader may see him on Job 10. 1. and on Prov. 6. 22.

C H A P. XXV.

Ver. 8. *Full of days.* שֶׁבַע יָמִים. The word יָמִים is not in the present Hebrew Text: but 5 or 6 mss. with Sam. and almost all the antient versions, have it, and it evidently is a part of the Text. It is indeed wanting in the Chaldee of Onkelos in the London Polyglott, which has only שֶׁבַע; but the Complutenian edition, that of Venice 1590, and several mss, have שֶׁבַע יָמִים. Arab. Erp. has only سبعة *, and Gr. Ven. has only *ἑπταήμερος*.

Ver. 16. *Castles.* מִצְרֹת. Some modern critics imagine that these castles were moveable cot- tages, *mapalia*. So Faber, Dathe, Schulze: but Michaëlis *schlössern*. I still think this is the true meaning: they were fastnesses or strong holds for self-defence against sudden attacks: and מִצְר has never the meaning of a *cottage* either fixt or moveable.

Ver. 21. I have said in my explanatory note, that some critics think that the word which I have rendered *for לְכָרֵךְ*, denotes rather the *time* of praying, than either the *cause* or *place* of praying. So Houbigant: "Orat Isaac coram uxore sua, i. e. cum ea innox congressurus." This meaning is strongly supported by the Arabic signification of לְכָרֵךְ, *inire fœminam*. In other places of Hebrew scripture it generally signifies *over against*: and so it is here rendered by On- kelos and most of the oriental translators; although their versions have *pro*. But Sep. Syr. Vulg. and Gr. Ven. have respectively *παρὰ, πρὸς, pro, ὑπὲρ*, which I, with Dathe, have followed in my translation.

Ver. 27. *Who lived at home.* יָשַׁב אֲדָמָה. Sep. *οικων οικισαν* †. The word אָדָם signifies not only a *tent*, but any sort of *house* or *home*. Some think that by the words יָשַׁב אֲדָמָה is meant only that *he led the life of a shepherd*. So Dathe, *vitam pastoritiam præferebat*: and Michaëlis, *erwâlte das birtenleben in gezelten*. I think they mean nothing more than that he lived at home with his parents.

C H A P. XXVI.

Ver. 12. *AN hundred returns.* מֵאָה שְׁעָרִים. The word שֶׁר has various meanings; but per- haps all reducible to one root. Here it seems to denote a species of *barley*, of a blackish colour, which, as we learn from Niebuhr, is very prolific. Sep. and Theod. *καὶ σπέρμα*, Syr. *סער*. The rest seem to have considered שֶׁר in its Chaldee meaning, *estimation, reckoning*. I have prefer- red the word *returns*: that is, *an hundred for one*; whether barley, or any other bearded grain; for this is certainly the meaning. Vulg. *centuplum*.

Ver. 33. *The swearing well.* שְׁבַעָה. Sep. *επαρκος*. But Aquila and Synmachus *πληθυσμος*. Vulg. *abundantia*: and this meaning is by some moderns preferred to the other. Singular is Gr. Ven. which renders *ἐπτα seven*: and, again, calls the city *ἑπτα ἑβδομα*.

* De Rossi says, the addition is also wanting in the Constantinopolitan edition of Saadias: which edition I have not the good fortune to possess. † Two mss. the Aldine edition and Cyril. AL. have *οικων εν οικια*.

C H A P. XXVII.

Ver. 38. *PENETRATED with sorrow.* κατανυχθεὶς. I have said in my Note, that it is not probable that the Greek translators * added this of themselves: I have therefore given it a place in my version: but I have, for the sake of perspicuity, arranged my Text in a somewhat different manner, as the learned reader will readily perceive.

Ver. 39. *Remote, &c.* The Hebrew words are, מִשְׁכְּנִי הָאֶרֶץ יְדוּהָ מִשְׁבֵּן וְטַטְל הַשָּׁמַיִם מֵעַל, which have been interpreted in two very different manners and opposite meanings. All the antient interpreters, and all our English translators, save Purver, render the prefix מֵעַל by *of*, or some equivalent term: as if Isaac had promised to Esau a fat fertile soil fed by the dews of the heavens. And so even Dathe: "Fertilem terram habitabis, e cælo largè roratur." And Michaëlis: "Fett an boden wird deine wohnung feyn, und von oben herab vom himmel beth-aet." Notwithstanding all this mass of authority, I am clearly of opinion, that the version of Castalio, Le Clerc, Houbigant, &c. is the true one; and that מֵעַל here is a privative preposition, as it is in several other places †, and ought to be rendered by *absque, without*. Indeed without this there would be no contrast between the benediction of Esau and that of Jacob. Nor was Idumæa, or Edom, a fat fertile soil. On the contrary, Malachi tells us that God had made it a fit residence for the dragons of the desert ‡. See the explanatory note.—I will only add, that the Greek version itself admits this explanation: for ἀπο is often equivalent to *ab*, or even *procul a*, remote from: as ἀπο τῆς πατρίδος—ἀπ' ἐλπίδος, *procul a patria—fine spe*.

Ver. 40. *On thy desert thou shalt live.* עַל חֶרֶבְךָ תֵּחִי. I have, in this instance, departed from all the versions antient and modern. They all render עַל חֶרֶבְךָ by *thy sword*. Yet I cannot think that חֶרֶב here means a sword. If it did, the construction would have been בְּחֶרֶבְךָ, not עַל חֶרֶבְךָ: at least, I can find no other example of עַל having that meaning. Isaac had told him before that he was to inhabit a dry barren soil; he now bids him be content with his portion, and live on the desert allotted to him, until the time come when he shall be able to throw off the yoke of his brother; that is, of his brother's posterity.

Ver. 42. *Hath resolved.* מְתַנַּחֵם. Sep. ἀπειλά. Vulg. *minatur, threatens*, which Dathe follows. I rather think the meaning of the word is a gloomy resolution of mind, which consoles itself with the hope of vengeance, *manet alta mente repostum*. It is well rendered in the Greek of Venice, παραμυθῆσθαι.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Ver. 13. *STANDING by him,* נֹצֵב עִלָּיו, which is generally rendered *standing on it*, i. e. on the ladder. So Sep. ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνθῆς. and Vulg. *innixum scala*: and so equivalently almost all modern versions. Yet I am persuaded that this is not the meaning; and that עִלָּיו should here be rendered, not *super eam*, but *juxta eam*. Saadias so, certainly, understood it וְנֹצֵב עִלָּיו; and so, I think, the Syr. Onkelos, and the Targum of Jonathan §, ought to be rendered. It

* I suppose they read in their copy מִשְׁבֵּן, which, in Gen. 34. 7. is rendered by the same Greek verb. † See Noldius. ‡ Malach. 1. 3. § This last is therefore, in my opinion, rightly translated, in the Polyglott, *juxta eam*: the two former wrong, *super eam*.

is not probable that Jacob saw the apparition at the ladder's top, which, we are told, reached the heavens; but standing by him על at the foot of the ladder. Wherever a word, or phrase, is susceptible of a double or multiple meaning, that is always to be preferred which is most natural and analogous.

Ver. 19. *Ulam-luz.* אֱלָם לֹז * . With Sep. †, Capellus, and Houbigant, I take אֱלָם to be a part of the name of the place. Others make it an adverb, and render *utique, certe*; our vulgar version *but*. But this last word is sufficiently expressed by the prefix ו; and if the word אֱלָם be here considered as an adverb, it is visibly an useless pleonasm ‡.

Ver. 21. *And thou be a God to me.* I make this a part of the conditions; not of the consequent vow: and in this sense it seems to have been understood by all the antient translators, save Syr. Vulg. and Perf. who took the prefix *vau* in the sense of *tum, then*, and make it a part of Jacob's vow. So our English translators: "Then shall the Lord be my God:" a version which Delgado justly blames, and well rectifies. Yet Dathe so translates *semper cum ut Deum meum colam.* Not so Michaëlis, nor Schulze, nor Rosenmüller, who all understand it as a part of the conditions §. "Ad protafin pertinet; sequitur apudofis."

CHAP. XXIX.

Ver. 2. *DROVES.* רְעִים. Some modern critics would read רְעִים *shepherds*: and I once thought that a plausible emendation. But I see, now, no necessity for rejecting the present reading. Delgado's observation on the word is apt and judicious.

Ver. 21. *My time is completed.* כִּי מָלֵא יִשְׁׁ. These words are supposed, by some moderns, to mean only that Jacob was a full-grown man. "Hæc verba (says Rosenmüller) non ad completum *servitutis* tempus, sed ad maturitatem *ætatis* Jacobi pertinent. Petit sibi Rahelam, quia jam ad ætatem plus satis justam pervenerit." So Michaëlis: "Ich bin schon bey vollen Jahren."—I cannot believe that the Hebrew words will bear this meaning; which has been thought of only to reconcile the chronology of the history of Jacob and his sons. Dathe follows the common rendering: "Quod tempus constitutum esset completum."

Ver. 32. *And given me a son.* This addition I have inserted on the sole authority of Sep. and the old Coptic version. It is wanting, however, in Compl. and Alex. and in 8 mss.

CHAP. XXX.

Ver. 8. *WITH great rivalry, &c.* נִפְתָּלִי אֶלְדָּם נִפְתָּלִי עִם אָחִיו. This is variously rendered by the antient interpreters. Sep. συναγλαστο || μου ὁ Θεός και συναγλαστον τη αδελφη μου. Vulg.

* The Sam. Text has אֱלָם; but not in one word, as Rosenmüller asserts. He was deceived by the Latin version in the Polyglott. † Ουλαμλουζ. So Ald. Vat. with Copt.—Nineteen of Holmes's mss. have Ουλαμματος and Cod. Alex.

with Austin, have Ουλαμματος all manifest corruptions. ‡ The common meaning of אֱלָם is a *court* or *vestibule*. Here it seems to denote some *suburb*, or *out-port*, belonging to *Luz* or *Luxa*. Perhaps it was so understood by *Aquila*, whose true reading is, with great probability, supposed by Scharfenberg to have been *προθυρογ*. See his *Animadversiones*, p. 28. § So before them Houbigant: *et fuerit mihi Dominus in Deum.* || Sixteen mss. with Compl.

and Ald. have συναγλαστο, and two mss. with Alex. have συναγλαστο. One ms. has ανταγλαστο. Perhaps ανταγλαστο is the primitive reading.—*Aquila*, συναγλαστον με ὁ Θεός, και συναγλαστον.

comparavit

comparavit me Deus cum sorore mea. Both took אֱלֹהִים for a nominative; but how, out of the present words, they could make either of these meanings, is to me incomprehensible. Onkelos likewise makes *God* the nominative; but wildly paraphrases thus: "The Lord hath granted my request, on my supplication: in my prayer I desired to have a son, as well as my sister, and the boon has been granted me." On the other hand, Jonathan makes *Rabel* the nominative, but paraphrases still more loosely than Onkelos. The Syr. translator has rendered only the three last words, and rightly rendered them: "I have contended with my sister." Saadiah: "Commiseration from God I have obtained," &c. Arab. Exp. رَبَّانَا إِلَهًا رَعْبِيَّةً مَعَ أَخَوَاتِي. Gr. Ven. ἀποστολὴν Θεοῦ ἀποστολῆσαι ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ ἀδελφῇ. These two last have, at least, endeavoured to give a literal version of the original; to which let us now return.

The radical meaning of the word פָּתַל is *tortuousness, writhing, wattle*, twisting, &c.* Hence, in Niphal, it signifies *to be writhed*, that is, *to struggle*†; for, in struggling, the body is writhed, and the limbs entwined with those of the antagonist. This, then, is the literal meaning of נִפְתַּל: but as the strugglings of Rabel were only metaphorical strugglings or emulations, I have preferred the words *rival* and *rivalry*.

Ver. 9. The addition in this verse is from the Rom. and Alex. editions of the Septuagint. It is wanting in Ald. Compl. and 13 of Holmes's mss.; but it is found in 15 mss. and in the Copt. and some other versions made from Sep. I have no doubt of its having been originally in the Text.

Ver. 11. *In luck, or luckily.* Whether we read בָּנָךְ with the printed Hebrew Text and all the Sam. copies, or בָּנָא with 8 mss. and the *Keri*, we must not give to בָּנָא the meaning of our common version, *a troop*. It signifies both here, and in Isa. 65. 11. *good fortune*, which was considered as a species of divinity; and from which our term *God* is derived. All the ancient versions concur in rendering בָּנָא here by a word equivalent to *good luck*. Sep. בָּנָא †. Vulg: *feliciter*. Both read בָּנָךְ with the present Text. The others seem to have read בָּנָא; but still בָּנָא is rendered *luck*, or something equivalent. Thus Syr. אַחַת בָּנָא. Onk. אַחַת בָּנָא. Jon. אַחַת בָּנָא. Saad. מַלְאכָא בָּנָא. Arab. Exp. בָּנָא בָּנָא. Perf. בָּנָא בָּנָא. The Greek of Venice alone has καὶ σπουδαίᾳ. The argument urged in favour of this rendering, from Jacob's allusion in the benediction of his children, is frivolous. It is well known that the Hebrews played upon the same word differently, on different occasions. Jacob's allusion to *a troop* would, in the mouth of Lea, have been ridiculous: whereas nothing could be more natural than the expression she uses; and which she repeats, in other terms, in the very next verse. Our best modern critics have rendered as I have done: Houbigant, *feliciter*. Dathe, *fortunâ favente*. Michaëlis, *cum guten gluck*.

Ver. 20. *With a good endowment bath the Lord endowed me.* וְבָרַךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־יִצְחָק. The words וְבָרַךְ and וְבָרַךְ no where else occur. Hence they have been variously rendered. In Arabic, وَبَر,

* Our words *wattle* and *wattling* are, I doubt not, derived from it. † So the Latin deponent *ludor*; which, by the bye, is construed in the same manner as our Hebrew verb *ludor cum*; the root of which, I have no doubt, is the Arabic لَوَد, to *twist, writh*, &c. ‡ So Ald. Vat. and Alex.; but Compl. and 23 mss. have *στυχεύω* I am *lucky*.

If this were the genuine reading of Sep. I should suppose that they read in their Hebrew copy בָּנָא, as we still read בָּנָא in the next verse: and the Syr. reading בָּנָא seems to strengthen this conjecture. § The Jerusalem copy has

בָּנָא, *good luck*.

has, with other significations, that of a *gift*: and in this sense it was understood by Sep. *Δεδοται δ' Θεος μοι * δωρον καλον*. So Vulg. *Dedit me Deus date bona*. And so equivalently all the ancient versions, even Gr. of Venice, which has *αγαθημεν—χαρημεν*. I see no reason to seek a new meaning. Schultens's translation, *Utrum (i. e. utrum) mihi meum optima agitavit Deus agitatione*, a metaphor borrowed from churning butter, is highly ridiculous. See Michaëlis's *Supplementa*.

lb. *will delight in me*. יוֹבֵלִי. This word, which with Sep. I render *will delight in me*, is commonly rendered *will dwell with me*: but then it should have been יוֹבֵל עִמִּי, for which indeed some grammarians pretend it here stands. All the ancient versions, however, save Sep. and Syr. give the idea of *habitation*: and the word in some other places seems hardly to admit another meaning. But still that meaning to me appears a forced one here: for did not Jacob *dwell with her* already?—I therefore think the radical meaning is to be sought in the Chald. and Syr. dialects, the latter of which Lea most probably spoke. Now in both these dialects יוֹבֵל signifies *to dung a field*; and thence, to *cultivate*. I see not why this, in a tralatitious sense, may not be the meaning here. “My husband will now *carefs* me more and more; will consider me as a fruitful field, and cultivate me with assiduity.” The allusion, in our language is not very delicate: but this is no reason why it should be so in the Hebrew. To be *kind to a field* is, among farmers, equivalent to *manure it well*: and we have no scruple in saying, metaphorically, of a prolific wife, that she is a *well-cultivated, fertile soil* †.

lb. *Zebulun*. His name is supposed, by some critics, to allude to both יוֹבֵל and יוֹדֵד. I am inclined to think it has no relation to the latter word.

Ver. 32. *Let me pass*. אָעָבֵר. So all the copies and ancient versions, save Sep. and Vulg. which have *παράλθω—gyra* ‡: as if the former had read יַעֲבֹר, and the latter עָבֵר.

lb. *Remove*. הָסֵר, or rather הָסִיר, as Sam. which Pagninus renders *movendo*: but Sep. and Vulg. imperatively *διαχωρισον—separa*. And so even the Greek of Venice, *αφαις*. The rest seem to have read הָסִיר in the first person; and this appears to be the more natural reading.

lb. *The grizzled*. חֹסֶה, commonly rendered *black* §; by our public version *brown*; which is more agreeable to the etymon of the Hebrew word. I prefer *grizzled* for two reasons: First, because I doubt if there be any sheep of a brown colour. Secondly, because the Syr. translator, who must have been well acquainted with sheep of that country, renders בְּחֹרְתָא *black mingled with white*. This is indeed an uncommon colour; and hence the bargain was the more specious on the part of Jacob: whereas black sheep are common enough; and perhaps made a very considerable part of Laban's flock ||.

* Compl. with 18 mss. have *μοι δ' Θεος*. Note: The Compl. and Rom. editions are here wrongly pointed. The point should be after *καλον*, as it is in Ald. Alex. and 3 mss. † The Greeks, in a similar sense, used *αρουρα*: and the Latin *arvum genitale*. ‡ This, however, is not of Jerom, who, in Q. Hebr. thus renders, *Transibo*, &c.

§ So Pagninus, Hoobigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, and most of our English versions; and so Onkelos, Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. and perhaps the Arab. Pol. *חֹסֶה* ought so to be understood, although his Latin translator renders it by *versicolor*. Sep. has *φαιον*, and Vulg. *furvum*. || In a manuscript Account of Lisbon I have read the following words: “I saw

“ (in the grounds about the city) on one side a flock of sheep, all white: on the other, at a very small distance, another flock, all black: this last kind are extremely common here; and I am told it is of their wool that Saragossa cloth is made.”

With respect to the Text itself, there is visibly much confusion in it; as Jerom long ago remarked: "Multum apud Septuaginta Interpretes confusus est sensus; et, usque in præsentem diem, nullum potui invenire nostrorum, qui, ad liquidum, quid in hoc loco diceretur, exponeret." He then gives his own interpretation, which is very just, although it is not a literal version of the present Text. "Wouldst thou have me serve thee, says Jacob, seven years more? Grant me this request: Separate all the parti-coloured and variegated both of the sheep and goats, and deliver them to thine own sons to keep apart. Then to me give the keeping of all the black and white; and let such as shall henceforth be variegated among them, be mine. My request is not a hard one: the nature of flocks is on your side: for white commonly produce white young ones, and black produce black." Q. Hebr.—This, I think, is the genuine meaning: but still the Text is imperfect; and should, in my conception, be thus restored: הָסִיר מִשֶּׁם כָּל שֶׂה נֶקֶד וְשֵׁלֹא בְעִיִּים וְכָל שֶׂה חֹם בְּכֻשִּׁיִּים וְשֵׁלֹא תִקְוֹר בְּעִיִּים וְחֹם בְּכֻשִּׁיִּים יִהְיֶה שֶׁמֶרֶץ
The addition of בְּעִיִּים after וְשֵׁלֹא is in one of Kennicott's mss. 173*. The second addition, preceding the concluding comma, is a conjectural emendation, which, in my version, I have expressed in Italics.—We must either admit, I think, this emendation, or with Sept. throw out the first comma altogether, and render thus: "Remove every grizzled beast among the sheep, and every spotted and speckled beast among the goats; and let such henceforth be my hire." There will then be nothing redundant: yet I prefer the other reading, on this general principle, That few interpolations have crept into the Hebrew Text, compared to the many mutilations it has undergone. Besides, verse 35. is a guarantee for the order of the present Hebrew, and, I presume, for the alterations which I have made in it.

V. 37. *Plane-tree*. עֵרְמוֹ. Sep. *ωλειανος*. Vulg. *platanus*, whom I have followed. See explanatory note, and correct *platenus* into *platanus*. The other versions vary: and, indeed, it is very uncertain what peculiar tree is here meant.

Ver. 40. It is hard, if not impossible, to make any tolerable meaning out of the Text as it stands at present, and which is thus literally rendered in our public version: "And Jacob did separate the lambs, and set the faces of the flocks toward the ring-freaked, and all the brown in the flock of Laban." Let him, who can, make any thing of this †.

The chief difficulty lies in these words וְיָצָא מִן הָאֵל עֵקֶה. Instead of עֵקֶה מִן הָאֵל, Sam. has עֵקֶה מִן הָאֵל a variegated ram; and so Sep. *κρίον διαλαλεῖον*. But neither does this reading agree with the context, nor make any good sense. The Latin Vulgate is yet more wild: "*Et posuit virgas in canalibus ante oculos arietum!*" Syr. followed the present Hebrew, but gave a different meaning to עֵקֶה. Onkelos, the Targum of Jonathan, and Saadiah, seem to have read כָּל instead of מִן; which reading is adopted by Houbigant, and gives an excellent meaning; which I have followed in my version. Perhaps the present reading might be defended, by making מִן here the sign of the objective case, as it sometimes is: but כָּל or כָּל מִן would certainly be more natural, and exclude all ambiguity. With respect to פָּנֵי, it often stands for לְפָנֵי, and may be here rendered *beside*, *opposite to*, *apart from*: and was so understood by the three last-men-

* Saadiah seems also to have read it in his copy.

† I mean the common printed editions; for 5 of Holmes's mss. with Cyr. Alex. have, after *προβατων—ποικιλον και περιτρον*—or *περον*; which may be the production of some emendator, on comparing his Greek exemplar with the Hebrew.

‡ "Scripturam talem frustra interpretari velis." Houbigant.

tioned ancient translators. I have taken no notice of Dathe's and Michaëlis's versions *; nor of Delgado's transposition, because I deem them all ill-founded.

C H A P. XXXI.

Ver. 15. *AS strangers.* בְּנִכְרִים. So Sam. and the versions mentioned in explanatory note: to which add Gr. Ven. which has *ως αλλοτρία*. It is to be observed that neither Houbigant nor Kennicott take any notice of this variety of lection in the Sam. copies.

Ver. 18. The parenthesis in this verse is wanting, as I have remarked in Various Readings, in Syr. Arab. and 4 mss. but not in either Sep. or Vulg. as De Rossi too rashly asserts. The former expresses it after *Phadan-Aram*, *και παρτα τα εαυτου*: the latter more briefly, by *quidquid*. It is also equivalently in Onkelos, although omitted by his Latin translator.

Ver. 20. *Thus Jacob eluded Laban.* יָנַב אֶת לֵב לָבָן. Lit. *stole Laban's heart*; or rather his mind, that is, his attention; an Hebraism somewhat like the *κλεπτε νοῦ* of Homer.

Ver. 29. *In my power, &c.* וְיָ לֵא לִי, which Arias Montanus literally renders *est ad fortitudinem manus mea*. Pagninus, *fortitudo in manu mea est*. Sep. *ερχου* (8 mss. *ερχου*) ἡ *χειρ μου*, Vulg. *valet manus mea*. And so equivalently all the antient versions. Michaëlis, however, has struck out a new version, which is at least specious. He thinks *לֵא* means here *God*: and renders *Est pro Deo manus mea*; that is, *Mine own hand is a God sufficient for me*. So Mezentius in Virgil. *Æn.* 10. ver. 773.

*Dextra, mihi Deus, et telum, quod missile libro,
Nunc adsint*

But it is not probable that Laban, who everywhere else appears very religious, should on this occasion be so outrageously blasphemous. The common version, therefore, seems far the more preferable †.

Ver. 32. *And take it.* Sep. adds, "but nothing could he detect with him," *και ουκ ερευνασεν οτι ουτω αθεν*. Nobilius mistakes, when he affirms that these words are wanting in Complut. They are there, only with the variation of *αθεν* for *αθεν*: the former of which is also the textual reading of 3, and the marginal reading of 2 mss.: and so read Chrysostom.

Ver. 38. *These twenty years, &c.* Dr. Kennicott ‡ fancied that these twenty years are different from those mentioned ver. 41. and would render thus, ver. 38. "*During the one twenty years, &c.*: ver. 41. *During the other twenty years, &c.* He supposes that Jacob was, altogether, 40 years in Phadan-Aram; namely, 14 years as a covenant-servant for Rachel and Lea; 20 in Laban's neighbourhood as a friend; and 6 in Laban's house, a covenant-servant for cattle. By this distribution, he thinks, we are delivered from the *distresses* and *contradictions* that attend the chronology of Jacob.—But whatever become of Chronology, which is extremely uncertain both here and in many other places, certain I am that the Hebrew Text admits not

* The latter took לָבָן to be an appellative noun, and thus translates: "und stellet die weissen schafe so, das sie den an den füßen gezeichneten gegen-über stunden."
† Yet the Greek translator of Venice appears to have had the same idea as Michaëlis: *εστὶ τῶ θεῷ χεὶρ ἡ ἐμὴ*.

‡ *Remarks on Select Passages*, p. 26, &c.

of such an interpretation; and that the 20 years in ver. 41. are no other than the 20 years in ver. 38.

Ver. 39. *I was scorched*, &c. The present Text has נִבְרַתִּי; Sam. נִבְרַת, which Houbigant supposes to be the true reading; "Superfluit in fine, ex falsa iteratione litteræ יוּם subse-
quentis, et in altero נִבְרַתִּי ex falsa imitatione mendi prioris." The Sam. reading seems, indeed, to have been that of Sep. κλεμματα ἡμερας, και κλεμματα νυκτος. And so perhaps Syr. Vulg. and Erp. Arab. although they render in the singular. None of them express the affix: which seems here awkwardly employed. The Latins said *furari alicui*: but I doubt if the Hebrew language admit of such an idiotism. Gr. Ven. clearly thought it could, and must have read as the present Text: for he renders, not inelegantly, κλαπεν μοι ἡμερας, κλαπεν μοι νυκτος.—I am decidedly of opinion that י made a part of the original word; but that the original word was not נִבְרַתִּי but נִבְרַתִּי; not a noun, but a verb in the first perf. sing. Both Onkelos and Saadiah, and even the Persian translator, considered it as such; and in truth they could hardly consider it otherwise if they read it with a *jod*. Had the writer meant it as a noun, he would most probably have used נִבְרַת, as in ch. 30. 33. Besides, the sentence is badly connected as it now stands: "What was *torn* I brought not to thee, I was accountable for it; and, *stolen* by day or *stolen* by night." Whereas make a verb of the word נִבְרַתִּי, changed into נִבְרַתִּי*, and join the whole comma to the following verse; the blemish will be turned into a beauty, and the energy of Jacob's words appear in its full force.

Ver. 44. *And let it be for a witness*. לָעֵד וְזֵכֶר Michaelis points לָעֵד, and renders *for ever*. But all the versions are against him; and the phrase is uncouth. If the writer had meant to express the duration of the covenant, he would, I conceive, have used לְעוֹלָם. The emendation is ingenious, but not necessary.

Ver. 51. *Which thou hast erected*. It is clear from ver. 45, that Jacob erected the stone. The present Text then, which has יָרַדְתִּי, must be wrong; and the Sam. reading יָרַדְתָּ† right.

V. 53. *The Gods of our fathers*. The present Hebrew Text has *the Gods of their father*, which cannot be the genuine reading, if considered as a part of Laban's speech; but must be looked upon as a mere marginal note, which afterwards crept into the text. A more tolerable reading is that of 10 mss. and some copies of Onk. which have the copulative ו before אֱלֹהֵי; as if Laban had said, *The God (or Gods) of Abraham, and the God of Nabor, and the Gods of their father, judge*, &c.—Instead of אֱלֹהֵי, Sam. and three or four Heb. mss. with some copies of Onk. have אֱלֹהֵי; but this is a still less probable reading than the other.—In Sep. the Copt. version, and 2 Hebrew mss. the words are wanting ‡; and Houbigant, Kennicott,

* From נִבְרַת, which is not indeed elsewhere found as a verb in Hebrew; but in Chald. Syr. Sam. signifies *to parch*, *to be scorched*, &c.; and as a noun, even in Hebrew, it has in some sort that meaning. See Jud. 1. 15. where, what is commonly rendered *a south land*, is by Jerom not ineptly rendered *terram arenem*: and there is little doubt but that נִבְרַת, the *south*, imports a *dry* quarter.

† The printed Sam. Text יָרַדְתָּ; but 2 mss. have preserved the right reading יָרַדְתִּי, which Onk. and Saadiah must also have found in their copies. In Sep. Ald. Rom. Alex. and in the Copt. versions, the whole comma is wanting: but it is in Compl. and some mss. which however have εἰρησας. Only one ms. (135) has the right reading εἰρησας. It is remarkable that Gr. Ven. has αἰεταλομεν; and so, it seems, the Armen. version.

‡ They are, however, in 5 of Holmes's mss. and in the Armen. version.—Some Hebr. mss. have אֱלֹהֵי אֲבִיךָ *your father*; an evident corruption.

and Bp. Law deem them a mere interpolation. They can certainly be easily spared: but as I am averse from admitting interpolations without strong motives, I think the true reading מַלְאָכֵי אֱלֹהֵינוּ has been preserved by the Syr. translator: and this reading I have followed in my version: only rendering מַלְאָכֵי in the plural, as more agreeable to the context. For the same reason, I prefer the reading of the present Heb. שָׁשׁ, which is that of Onk. Tharg. Arab. Erp. Perf. and Gr. Ven. to the Sam. reading שָׁשׁ, followed by Sep. Syr. Vulg. and Arab. Pol.

C H A P. XXXII.

Ver. 1. *Angels of God.* מַלְאָכֵי אֱלֹהִים. The word מַלְאָךְ properly signifies a messenger; and the angels or messengers here mentioned are considered by Abernethy as common travellers, from whom Jacob received the first intelligence of the approach of Esau.—Josephus calls them *phantoms*, φαντασματῶν: and, in truth, the whole story has more the air of a vision, than of a real occurrence. It seems to be the counterpart of the vision mentioned ch. 28. 12. It was not out of the road of nature to *dream* that the same God who had, in a *dream* at Bethel, encouraged him to proceed without fear on his journey into Mesopotamia, should on his return to Chanaan appear again to him for a similar purpose.—See the next Remark.

Ver. 24, &c. all to ver. 29. seems to be a mere vision or dream. The only objection to this is, that Jacob halted after the vision was over. To this objection I shall oppose the answer of Rosenmüller, without laying much stress upon it. “Nec obstat somnio, quod Jacobus mane claudicasset, quum notum sit, phantasie in dormientibus vim nonnunquam tantam esse, ut id quod in somnio læsum videbatur corporis membrum, ex somnio expergefaceris et vigilantibus verè doleat.”—There is a similar story, in Lycophron, of Jupiter’s wrestling a whole night with Hercules, by whom he was overcome.

Ver. 25. *On the hollow of the thigh.* כַּף יָד. What part this was has been a subject of controversy among interpreters. It is rendered by Sep. το πλάτος του μέρου. Vulg. *nervum femoris*. Syr. כַּף יָד, rendered in the Polyglott *convam*, but which should, I think, be rendered *palmam*, as the כַּף יָד of Onkelos is rightly rendered *palmam femoris**.—Saadias has כַּף יָד, which is commonly rendered *ischium* or *acetabulum*: but I question whether it have not here the same meaning with the Chaldee כַּף יָד. The Perse has כַּף, the very Hebrew word, and of the same meaning; namely, the interior *palm* of the hand. Gr. Ven. κοτύλη, that is, the *hollow* of the huckle-bone, as it is vulgarly called: but it may design any other *hollow*, as well as the other ancient versions.—Most modern translators have agreed in rendering the word by *acetabulum*; or some such word; that is, the *pan* which receives the *os femoris* or *buckle-bone*.—I cannot think that this is the meaning of כַּף, which denotes a small *curvature* like the interior *palm* of the *hand*, or that of a *spoon*, *sawcer*, &c. After having consulted several anatomists on the subject, I received from Dr. Baillie of Wind-mill-street the following very satisfactory answer: “There is no term of the *hollow of the thigh* used among anatomists: but Dr. B. thinks that the

* The Thargum of Jonathan has the same words, although they are rendered *latitudinem femoris*. The Jerusalem copy retains the Hebrew word כַּף, which is well rendered *vola*.
† Arab. Erp. has כַּף, if it be not an error of the Press.

"passage may be explained, with some plausibility at least, in the following manner:—At the upper part of the thigh, near the buttocks, there is, in the living body, a very considerable hollow between the upper part of the thigh bone and the *glutæi* muscles which constitute the buttock. This hollowness is especially to be seen when a person stands very upright, the *glutæi* being called into action*. The hollow is so very considerable, as to be observable to any common observer: and a most natural expression for it might be the *hollow of the thigh*†. At this place, any external force may be readily and immediately so applied as to throw the thigh-bone out of its situation; producing that sort of luxation, by which the limb is rendered longer than that on the other side. This explanation appears to Dr. B. to be tolerably clear and natural: whether it may be perfectly intelligible or satisfying to a person not conversant with anatomy, he cannot say."—To me, who am no anatomist, it is perfectly satisfactory: and I think it is the best commentary that ever was made on the passage.

Ver. 28. *For with God thou hast contended*, &c. The Text is כִּי שָׂרִית עִם אֱלֹהִים וְעִם אַנְשִׁים וְיָרָל, without any variety of lection either in the Sam. or Heb. copies; and which cannot be rendered any other way than I have rendered. Houbigant, however, and, after Houbigant, Dathe, and Rosenmüller (misled, I think, by Vulg. and the common edition of Sep.) have given to the passage another turn, and, pointing after אֱלֹהִים, render, or rather paraphrase, thus: "Quoniam ipsi Deo prevaluisti, e certamine cum hominibus superior quoque discedes." They reject the copulative before וְיָרָל, and ground the rejection partly on the authority of Sep. and Vulg.; and partly, because, in their apprehension, the sense and context require it. Jacob, says Dathe, had not yet contended with men: so his contest with the angel was meant to be a pledge of success, if in future he should have to contend with men.—But this is not just reasoning. He had contended with Esau, and supplanted him of his birth-right—he had contended with Laban, and got the better of him—He has now risen higher in the scale, and contended with God—He is therefore to be called ISRAEL, as well as JACOB‡.—All the antient translators read וְיָרָל, and understood it as I do, except Jerom, who, in his Heb. Q. thus renders: *Quia invaleuisti cum Deo, et cum hominibus valebis*.—The Septuagint version has also been forced to speak the same language: Ὅτι ἐνισχυσας μετὰ Θεοῦ, καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατὸς ἔσῃ. So the Roman edition. But Ald. Compl. Alex. and 27 mss. with Origen, Euseb. and Cyr. Al. want ἐν §: and, if this be the true reading, and properly pointed, the Greek will be conform to the Hebrew, and to the other Antient versions.—The Greek of Venice has very literally rendered the original: ἡξας γὰρ σὺν Θεῷ καὶ σὺν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ισχυσας.—Among moderns, Michaëlis has followed the same meaning: Denn du hast mit Gott und menschen gekämpft, und obgefict "get."—Not badly Delgado, though uncouthly: "Thou hast made thyself a lord both over

* In the act of wrestling, I doubt not but this hollow is still more conspicuous. † If my memory fail me not, this very hollow is, in some parts of Scotland, called the *kap*, or *cap*, of the thigh. The same word was formerly used for a round small dish, not unlike a sawcer, for drinking ale and whiskey. It is indeed the Hebrew word, and of the same original import; for, in all probability, the first drinking-*kap* was the cavity of the hand. The Swedish *küpp*, the Dutch and Danish *kop*, and our *cup*, come all from the same source. ‡ This last name fitted him with respect to his victories over Esau and Laban; which were obtained by *supplantation*, cunning, and dissimulation; but his prevailing over God was the consequence of a fair struggle, expressed by the name of *Israel*. § One *me*, has *εἰ*: and so the old Italic in Ausim: "*Quia valuisti cum Deo et cum hominibus, potens es.*"

angels and over men, and thou didst prevail."—This learned ~~and liberal~~ Jew seems to adopt the opinion of those expositors, who "think there is no reality in this narrative; and that what Scripture saith, That he, Jacob, *rose up at night*, &c. is the relation of a prophetic vision to the "end of the chapter."

C H A P. XXXIII.

Ver. 13. *GIVING suck.* חָמָר by our translators rendered *with young*: but as in 1 Sam. 6. 7. 10. "it must signify cattle which have brought forth; it should here and in Ps. 78. 71. and "Is. 40. 11. in which only places besides it occurs, since it may, it should probably be so interpreted." Secker's *Ms. Notes*. So the Ant. versions, except Sep. Vulg. and Perf.—Even Gr. Ven. has θηλαξουσιν.

Ver. 18. *Jacob arrived safe.* וְיַעֲקֹב עָמַר שָׁלֵם. Our translators, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. make שָׁלֵם a proper name, *Salem* or *Shalem*. But this is a mistake, rectified by Josephus, Onk. and all the other versions; even Gr. Ven. which hath rightly σως. Both Purver and Delgado have here properly corrected the common translation.—It is strange that this correction did not occur to the all-correcting Houbigant.

Ver. 19. *For an hundred kestas.* I have retained the Hebrew word כֶּסֶת because its precise meaning is not known. Most interpreters, after Sep. have understood it of *lambs*, more particularly *ewe-lambs*. So equivalently all the Ant. versions.—Some have imagined that it was a piece of money with the figure of a lamb on it: which is highly improbable; as coined money is of a much later date. Others, with Faber, fancy, it might have been a silver or gold *vase*, or *platter*, which was anciently given in change, in lieu of money. I suspect the word is of Syriac extraction, should be written with a *samach**, and rendered a *belt* or *girdle*. It is well known in what value *belts* were anciently holden. The Greek *μαζος* and the Latin *ceftus* are thence probably derived.

C H A P. XXXIV.

Ver. 1. *To visit the young women of the land*; probably at some general festival or assembly. She was curious, perhaps too curious, to see their customs, &c.—The ingenious J. M. Lobstein, from a reading of the Genovesan copy of the Sam. text, has attempted to shew that Dina did not go out of mere curiosity to see the Chanaanite women: but to *be seen*, and exhibit her own superior charms. "Ut formam, qua sibi mirificè placebat, terræ incolis conspiciendam præberet." Admitting this reading (לִרְאוֹת, instead of לִרְאוֹת) the words should be rendered *comparere inter filias terræ*; *to be seen among the young women of the land*. But as all the other copies and versions read as we now do, I see no reason for throwing upon poor Dina more guilt than she seems to have incurred. The objection to the present reading, drawn from the ב before בָּנֹת is not of much force. Several instances occur where it is placed in the same sort of construction. Thus Cantic. 6. 11. לִרְאוֹת בְּתָבִי דְּדָוִד. See also 1 Sam. 6. 20. Heb. 1. 5.—Dina then did not

* Even the Masoretes point the *w* as a *fs*; which is equivalent to *samach*.

go to be gazed at by the young women of the country, but to gaze at them. The meaning is well expressed by Sep. καταμθεω; and still better by Jonathan: לִימְרֵם בְּנִימָם *inspicere consuetudinem, to observe the manners*. Perhaps to look at would be the best, as well as the most literal English translation.—Michaëlis: “Bekanntschaft zu machen”—to make acquaintance with.

Ver. 14. The addition from Sep. wrongly marked among Var. Read. as belonging to v. 13. is so likely to have stood originally in the text, that I had once a great mind to insert it. It is, partly in all the known copies: and marked with an *obelos* in only two mss*. The last words and sons of Lea are wanting indeed in Compl. Rom. and Alex. but they are in Ald. and more than 30 mss. as also in the Copt. Arab. and Armen. versions, made from the Greek.

C H A P. XXXV.

Ver. 4. *THE pendants that were in their ears.* דְּמוֹנִים אֲשֶׁר בְּאוֹרֵיהֶם. This is a clear proof that דָּמוֹ means not precisely an *ear-ring*, nor a *nose-ring*; but something applicable to both: I have therefore always rendered it by a more general term, *pendant*. Those pendants seem to have been considered as sacred *amulets* or *talismans*; and had probably imprinted on them the rude figure of some profane divinity. See Le Clerc, and Maimonides.

Ver. 9. Delgado thinks that this and what follows, to the end of ver. 22. must be understood as if written before ver. 17. of ch. 33. I see no necessity for this supposition. The remark of the historian, that this happened after Jacob had come from Phadan-Aram, was meant only to discriminate this appearance of the Deity from that which took place before he went to Phadan-Aram.

Ver. 10. I have remarked in my Explan. Note, that the words *So his name was called Israel* are wanting in Syr. and most copies of Sep. that is, they are only found in Ald. and Rom. but wanting in Compl. Alex. and 26 mss. nor were they read by Justin Mart. nor by Nicetas:—they are in one ms. with an asterisk; and were read by Jerom, Q. Hebr.

Ver. 21. It is clear to me that Sep. has here alone preserved the due order of the narrative, by placing what is in the present text after ver. 20. immediately after ver. 15. Ἀπαρὰς δὲ Ἰακώβ ἐκ Βοσθῆλ, ἐπέξῃ τῇ σκηνῇ αὐτοῦ ἐπενεῖνα τοῦ πυργου Γαδὲρ. κ.τ.λ. Let the reader transfer it to where it now stands in the Hebrew, and say if it come in there naturally.

1b. *Beyond Migdol-Eder.* Probably the same with that mentioned in Michah 4. 8. Whether this tower were not far from Bethlehem, or near to the Sheep-gate of Jerusalem, if Moses had written this, he would not, he could not have expressed himself in this manner. In describing a journey from Bethel to Bethlehem, he could not with propriety say of any intermediate place that Jacob had come *beyond it*, when such or such an event happened: whether he be supposed to have written his history in Egypt, or on his way to Chanaan. But, indeed, every thing convinces me, that the Pentateuch, as we now have it, was composed at Jerusalem, or at least in Palestine.

* The collator adds Alex. But this and other marks in that edition belong not to the *codex* itself; any more than the additions in a smaller character. All this is the work of the editor. The *ms.* is fully expressed, either in the text or margin, in one uniform letter of a larger size. Those who use Dr. Holmes's Collation must always keep this in mind.

Ver. 16. *But a little way.* עַד כְּבֵרֶת *וְדָרֶץ. It is generally agreed that the word כְּבֵרֶת denotes some measure of length; but what measure, it is not so easy to determine. Some, deriving the word from the verb כָּבַר, make it an indefinite term, signifying *a great way*. So Tharg. Bab. and R. J. Menahem. Others derive it from כְּבֵד *food* (considering the כ as a prefix) and think it means as much ground as one can walk over from morning to meal-time: a fanciful and forced explanation. Jarhi is of opinion that it was about a German mile: and this idea has been adopted by Michaëlis, Dathe, Schulze, Rosenmüller &c. They were chiefly induced to this, by the distance which Rahel's tomb, according to travellers and geographers, is now from Bethlehem. But who will assure us that what is now called Rahel's tomb, is the real place where she was interred? We know that tombs, like catacomb-relics, have been arbitrarily christened, if I may here use the term: and the authority of a Benjamin Tudelensis, an Abulfeda, or even of a Jerom or Eusebius, is in such cases not always to be relied on. All that we know of Rahel's sepulchre is from 1 Sam. 10. 2. and from Jerem. 31. 15, quoted by Matthew 2. 28. From the former passage we learn that the tomb of Rahel was on the way from Rama to Gabatha-Benjamin; by the latter, that it could not be far from Rama; and by Matthew's application of it to Herod's infanticide, that it must have been in the vicinity of Bethlehem.—From the Ant. Versions little light is thrown upon the subject. Sep. retain the Hebrew word *כִּיבְרֶת*. In P. P. indeed, ch. 48. 7. they have *κατα τον ιντροδομον χιβραθ της γης*: where I conceive *ιντροδομον* to be their interpretation of *כִּיבְרֶת*; which in pointing ought to be included in a parenthesis: as if in an English version we were to say: “And had but a little way (*chibrath*) to arrive at Ephrath.”—Syr. פִּרְסָא which, in the Polyglott, is rendered *stadium*. But I take it to be the same with the Persic פרסنگ or פרסה, which latter is the very reading of the Persic version; and favours the opinion of those who are for a German mile, or *parasang*. Both Arabs have *a mile* מִל, or 1000 paces; and this may be accounted *a little way* compared with *a parasang*.—Onkelos has כְּבֵד, indeterminately rendered by his Latin translator *spatium*; but which I am persuaded means *a furlong*, from כָּבַד *to plow*: and this I take to be the most probable of all the versions.—The author of the Latin Vulgate gave another turn to the passage, *verno tempore*; which opinion he seems to have borrowed from certain Jewish interpreters, who, according to Jarhi, imagined that the historian meant to describe that season of the year when the earth was *bored* as it were like a *seve*, כְּבֵד; namely after the winter frosts, at the commencement of *spring*. But Jerom in his Q. Hebr. explains it more fancifully still. After observing that Aquila had rendered *καθ' οδον της γης* in *itinere terræ*, he adds: “Sed melius est si transferatur in *electo† terræ tempore*. Ποιρο *vernum tempus* significat; quum in florem cuncta rumpuntur; et anni tempus *electum* est: “vel quum transeuntes per viam carpunt et *eligunt* e vicinis agris quidcunque ad manus “venerit.” I hardly think that any modern will *pluck* and *choose* this interpretation.—Singular is the rendering of Gr. Ven. *κατα σημειον της γης*. Had he the Arabic בֵּרַת in view; which signifies *duz* vel *index itineris*—*a way-post* ‡!

* I suspect that the מ in וְדָרֶץ has been disjoined from the preceding word, and that the true reading is כְּבֵרֶת וְדָרֶץ, which is still that of one ms. and must have been that of Sep. Comp. ch. 48. 7. and 2 K. 5. 19. † From בֵּרַת *eligers*. ‡ Which *way-post* or *index* might be some lofty *pine*, or other *tree*; which בֵּרַת in Hebrew signifies. See Cant. 1. 7. where our translators have *fir*.

Let us now see what help can be had from the other few places in which the word is found. These are only two: Gen. 48. 7. and 2 K. 5. 19. In the former it is only a repetition of the passage here. In the latter it denotes the space of ground which Naaman had passed when Gehazi went after him to beg a present. Now this alone seems to afford a proof that the space was short: for it is not credible that Gehazi's avidity would let the Syrian proceed a whole German mile, before he thought of pursuing him. On the whole, then, I think that כְּבֵרִית, or כְּבֵרֶת, denotes a short space of way: and perhaps our first English translators, Coverdale, Matthew, &c. were not far wrong in calling it a *field-breadth*; i. e. a *furlong*: with which, I believe, the *ἡμετέριον* of Sep. and the כְּרֹב of Onkelos nearly accord. It is remarkable that in Spanish, or rather Morish, *huesbra* is an *acre* of ground, or *day-work* of land. See Minshew's Spanish Dictionary. Perhaps the Hebrew word might be not ineptly derived from כ and בְּרִית contracted into כְּרִית and rendered a *fragment*, *division*, or *cut* of ground: as we still provincially say, "there is a large *cut* of ground between such a place and such another place." Be this as it may, I am fully persuaded that the word denotes no great space; and have, therefore, with Ainsworth and our Public version, rendered a *little way*.

Ver. 22. The addition in this verse from Sep. is, says Rosenmüller, a *frigid* addition. But why? Was it not very natural for Jacob to be displeased, on hearing that his own son had violated his bed? The Masoretes themselves were sensible, that there was here a chasm in the text: and surely that chasm cannot be better filled up than by the words in Sep. *וְהָיָה עֵינָיו מְרֹמָם עַל הָעֵלֶּה* (or *עַל הָעֵלֶּה*) *עוֹלָם*. Hebr. וַיֵּדַע בְּעֵינָיו רָע. *Et fuit in oculis ejus malum.*

C H A P. XXXVI.

I HAVE not attempted to reconcile this chapter with ch. 26. with respect to the genealogies of Esau and Seir; because I found it a task beyond the compass of my abilities; without splashing the text in almost every verse, and bending it to wild conjecture: which I am never willing to do with the text of any author. Those who wish to see what efforts have (vainly, I think) been made to save the consistency of our historian may read what has been written by Michaëlis in the 9th tome of his *Oriental Library*, his *Dissertation on the Troglodytes*, and his German Notes on the Bible for the use of the unlearned. They may also consult Delgado's *observations* on the place: where they will see how far religious prejudice will lead an acute and sensible man, in support of the integrity of the Hebrew text.

Ver. 24. *These were the sons of Zibeon: Ajah, and Anah.* The present text has וַאֲחָי; hence some have imagined, that a name, or more, may have been dropt. But the Sam. text and version, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. and 4 mss. have וַאֲחָי without the copulative; which is also wanting, says De Rossi, in the original edition of Saadiah printed at Constantinople in Hebrew characters: and, what is more singular, it is wanting in the very literal Greek version of Venice, which has *Ὀὐδὲ δὲ υἱὸς Σαββαίου, Αἰὰς τε καὶ Ἀνάης*.

Ib. *It was this Anah who discovered the hot-baths &c.* The Hebrew word, which I render *hot-baths* is וַחֲמִים: but Sam. has וַחֲמִים: which variety of lection has given rise to various explanations. Those who follow the Sam. reading render "He found, i. e. he met with, *Emims*, "that is *giants*" &c. Onkelos seems so to have read, as he renders גְּבִירִים. This idea was adopted by

by Bochart, and defended by Simon in his Answer to Le Clerc: but has been generally abandoned by more modern critics *. The Thargumists make מולות *mules*, and think that Anah was the first who reared them. The Persic interpreter was of the same opinion. Sep. and the other three Greek translators retained the Hebrew word: but it is hard to say whether they followed the Hebr. or Sam. lection. In the copies of Sep. we find it in all the following varieties: אמר, אמרנ, אמרנא, אמרנ, אמרנ, אמרנ, אמרנ. One ms. only has אמרנ; and so read Jerom, *Iamim*: and this I take to be the original reading. This was also the reading of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, according to Montfaucon: but we learn from Jerom, Q. Heb. that the two former read אמר. Hence rightly Scharfenberg: "Præferendam esse puto lectionem *אמר* *אמר*, quam Aquila e codd. mss. restituit Vallartius; cui et libenter in eo assentior, quod Aquilam et Symmachum (nam et hic scripsit *אמר*, non, ut Montef. edidit, *אמרנ*) dicit proprio nomine *Emim* intellexisse, genus gigantum, quorum origo et sedes Horæis finitimæ Deut. 2. 2. describuntur." But this to me is noway convincing: nor can I think the giants have any thing to do here. "He found giants in the desert" is an uncouth expression: and if the *Emites* were a neighbouring people to the *Horites*, they could not be unknown to them.—I have therefore preferred the Hebrew reading, and rendered it with Vulg. and some interpreters mentioned by Jerom, *hot-baths*. "Nonnulli (says he) putant *aquas calidas*, juxta Punicæ linguæ viciniam, quæ Hebrææ contermina est, hoc vocabulo signari." The Syr. Translator seems to have considered it in this light; as he renders it מים *waters*: or, as Theodoret says, *מים* a fountain. ἡ γὰρ πηγή ΑἶΝΑ καλεῖται τῇ Συρίῳ φωνῇ. Theodor. vol. i. p. 101. nov. edit.—Both Arabs and Gr. Ven. follow the Thargums; and, with our common version, have *mules*.—Dathe: *thermas*.—Michælis: *die bader*.

1b. *When he was feeding the asses, &c.* Asses, as well as camels, are said to be very sagacious in discovering water, even under ground; and smelling it at a considerable distance. It might then be the asses, which Anah fed, that led him to the discovery of some copious spring, or perhaps lake† of water; whether *hot* or *cold*, may be questioned: but still a copious source of water in those arid regions would be accounted a capital discovery, and recorded by the historian as an important event.

Ver. 25. *The sons of Anah: Dishon . . .* A name may have been lost after *Dishon*: but I think the integrity of the Text may be defended. The word נר in the masculine plural here, is not more ungrammatical, than would be in Latin: *Nati sunt ei filius et filia*.—The Greek of Venice has therefore properly rendered; Ὅντι δὲ υἱὸς Ἀναν, Δισων καὶ Αἰδωλαίμω, θυγατὶς Ἀναν.

Ver. 31. *These are the kings, &c.* This and the 12 following verses were by Spinoza urged as one clear proof that the Pentateuch could not be written by Moses: if he had only said that *this part* of the Pentateuch could not be written by Moses, he would have said no more than

* Except Houbigant: who renders "qui dimicavit in deserto contra Emæos," &c. but, as our Bate has well observed, מול never signifies to *fight with*: but to *meet*, or *come up with*. † A lake of water was, in Hebrew, called a *sea*. The remark of Jerom is here to the purpose. "Iisdem litteris scribuntur maria (*siamim*) quibus et hic nunc sermo descriptus est. Et volunt (quidam) illum [Anam], dum pascit asinos patris sui in deserto, aquarum congregationes reperisse: quæ, juxta idioma linguæ, Hebræicè maria nuncupantur: quod scilicet *lagnum* repererit, cujus rei inventio in eremo difficilis est." Q. Hebr.

what every discerning reader must, in my conception, acknowledge. Nothing to me can be more evident than that all this was written after there were kings, or at least a king, in Israel.—But no, says Rosenmüller and some other modern critics: “*Evanescit hæc difficultas, si in memoriam revocamus, id quod Moses ipse paullo ante, c. 35. 11. narrat: Deum scilicet Jacobo promississe, fore ut ex eo reges orirentur. Vult igitur ille his verbis: Edomitæ jam octo reges habuerunt, antequam Deus promissum illud Jacobo datum in posteris ejus impleret.*”—I confess this is an argument I do not comprehend.—Delgado takes another, more ingenious method; and renders his Text thus: “Now these are the kings that reigned in the country of Edom, before the king that reigned cotemporary with the children of Israel.” But this is as forced, and far-fetched an interpretation as can well be made. The grammatical reason is, that, except in this place, מלך is constructed with a ך or an ךּ, and never with a ך. But surely he is not to learn, that ך holds frequently the place of a ךּ; and must, in English, be rendered *over* *. See Noldius. Not one of the Ant. translators so much as dreamed of this refinement: and yet I presume they understood the Hebrew idiom as well as Delgado, or his R. D. Kimhi. As the Greek version of Venice excellently renders the passage, and is less known than the Polyglott versions, I shall here content myself with giving it entire: *Οὗτοι θ' οἱ βασιλεῖς, ὅτε περ ἐβασίλευσαν ἐν τῇ γῇ Ἐδωμων, πρὸ βεβασίλευκεαι βασιλεῖς τοῖς ἱσταν Ἰσραηλ.*

C H A P. XXXVII.

Ver. 2. *AN evil report.* Some Jewish rabbis have imagined that the report which Joseph brought to his father of his brothers, was their eating raw flesh torn from live animals.—Others, with Grotius, think it was a crime not to be named. Useless conjectures! And well says Jarhi: “He told his father all the ill he knew of them.” There is here an egregious error in the Rom. Aldine and Alex. copies of Sep. *καταφρονειν δε [κατα] Ἰωσήφ ψυχὸν πατρὸς.* The word *κατα*, however, is in Ald. only; and this ought to have made the reading *καταφρονειν* be suspected. Complut. has *καταφρονει*; but this has been supposed to have been inserted without ms. authority; and to be one of those places which the editors corrected by the Hebr. and Vulg†. Luckily for their honour, I find that same reading in fix of Holmes’s ms. and in some Arabic versions made from Sep.—I shall, elsewhere, have occasion to shew how much the Complutensian editors have been injured by latter critics.

Ver. 3. *Because he was the son of his old age.* וְיָדָעְתָּ בְּיָמָיו כִּי סֵפֶר. Sep. *ὅτι υἱὸς γῆρας [or γῆρας] ἦν αὐτοῦ†.* So Vulg. though not so literally: *eo quod in senectute genuisset eum.* To the same purpose Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. But Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Persian translator understood the words יָדָעְתָּ בְּיָמָיו to signify *a prudent child*: lit. says Bp. Law (who seems to adopt this interpretation) *the son of the elders.* But this is a harsh and unnatural explication: and the other is evidently the meaning.

* Not to mention, that מלך is here in an unusual construction, both as *noun* and a *verb* together.

† Even Scharfenberg leans to this opinion. *Animadversiones ad Gen.* p. 37.

‡ It is worth remarking that instead of *Jacob*, which in the beginning of this verse is the reading of all the printed editions of Sep. and of the Copt. version, three of Holmes’s ms. with one or two Arab. and the Armenian version, have *Israel*. So read Jerom in the old Italic: and so all the other Ant. versions.

Ib. *An embroidered coat.* כְּתֹנֶת פָּסִים. By Montanus rendered *tunicam particularum*; a coat of patches. And this perhaps may be the literal meaning. Sep. χιτών ποικίλον. Vulg. *tunicam polymitam*. Syr. פְּדִימָה, rendered *fimbriatam* in Pol. but which, I think, would be better rendered *verficolorum*. Onkelos retains the Hebrew term. Jonathan כְּתֹנֶת מְצוּר *embroidered*. Both Arabs كِثْمَان, rendered *sericam (filken)* in Pol. but which, I am persuaded, signifies the same thing. The Chald. מְצוּר, *figured, embroidered, &c.* Giggæus renders by the Italian word *broccado* (our *brocade*); and in this sense it was taken by the Perfic translator. The Gr. of Venice keeps close to his Hebrew; and renders *περὶ βραχίων πωλαμῶν*, a coat of hand-breadths*; as if every piece of it were no bigger than the palm of the hand.—Whatever were the form or colours of the pieces that composed it, it was a coat of distinction; and such as was worn by the daughters of kings. See 2 Sam. 13. 18. and the Rem. on that place.

Ver. 4. *And could not speak to him peaceably.* Better, perhaps: *and would not give him the salutation of peace,* שָׁלוֹם לֹא. So Bp. Law in ms. notes.

Ver. 9. *And eleven stars.* I have not, with our public version, rendered *the eleven stars*; because, as Secker well observes, it is not known that any cluster of *eleven stars* was distinguished from the rest. They are here made *eleven* to equal the number of Joseph's brothers.

Ver. 25. I have said in my Explan. Note, that it is difficult to say what was the merchandize, which the Midianites were carrying to Egypt. I shall here lay their names before my reader, in the original and the antient versions; which he may examine at his leisure, and choose what he deems the most probable.—Hebr. נִכְאָר, צָר, לֵשׁ.—Sep. θυμιαματων, ῥητινης, στακτης.—Vulg. *aromata, refinam, flacten*.—Syr. נִכְאָר, צָר, לֵשׁ.—Onk. שֶׁפָּח, קָפָח, לֵשׁ.—Tharg. שֶׁפָּח, קָפָח, לֵשׁ.—Saad. שֶׁפָּח, קָפָח, לֵשׁ.—Erf. שֶׁפָּח, קָפָח, לֵשׁ.—Perf. שֶׁפָּח, קָפָח, לֵשׁ.—Gr. Ven. ἀρωμα, βαλσαμων, μαστιχη. Such is the variance among the antient interpreters. Nor are the moderns much more agreed. The curious reader may consult on the subject, Bochart, Celsius, Hillerus; and with respect to צָר, *balsam*, a *Dissertation on the fertility of Palestine* by H. E. Warnekros, in Eichhorn's *Biblical Repertory*, tom. xv. p. 227, &c.—In my version I have used the names which I thought the likeliest to express the original terms: and have only to observe, that the word *laudanum* would be better written *ladanum*, or *ledanum*; not *labdanum*, as some moderns spell it: for neither Theophrastus nor Pliny so write it. Herodotus has also λαδανον “which (says he) the Arabs call λαδανον.”

C H A P. XXXVIII.

Ver. 1. *AT that time.* בֵּעֵת וְדָמָה. An indefinite mode of expressing any occurrence, or event, unconnected with any particular period: somewhat like the *τοτε* of the Greeks, and the *εν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ* of the N. T. Hence, in the Roman Missal, every Sunday-gospel begins with *In illo tempore*.

Ver. 14. *At the gate of Enaim.* בִּפְתַּח עֵינַיִם. Interpreters differ about the meaning of עֵינַיִם. Is it a proper name, or an appellative? and if the latter, does it mean *fountains*, or *eyes*? Jerom is

* In Pl. 72. we find a word from the same root פָּס, denoting either a *handful*, or a *hand's-breadth*: or at least some very small quantity.

† These are made two drugs in the Latio, but I am persuaded they are but one compound.

for the latter: "Sensus est: sedit in *bivio*, five in *compito*; ubi diligentius debet viator aspicere, "quod iter gradiendi capiat:" hence Vulg. *in bivio itineris*, &c. The meaning, such as it is, is that it was a place where one must *open his eyes* to see which way he was to take. Syr. and Arab. seem to favour this explanation: and both Onkelos and Jonathan *may* be taken in the same sense; although I believe they had *fountains*, not *eyes*, in their view. The Peric translator is decidedly for *fountains*, נַחֲשִׁימִי. The Gr. of Venice has as plainly *eyes*: εν πύλαισι οφθαλμων.— I am inclined to think that *fountains* is the true meaning; but that it denotes the name of a place so called; as Sep. properly renders. *παρὰ τοὺς πύλας Ανοα* *. It was, no doubt, so called from the springs in its vicinity: as our *Wells* in Somersetshire, and elsewhere; *Wellingborough* in Northamptonshire; *Fontainebleau*, *Sept-fons*, and *Septfontaines*, in France. The Sam. version makes it the same with צַחֲזִיב *Chazib* mentioned ver. 5.

Ver. 18. *Thy signet, with thy ribband*: that is, the *string* by which the signet was suspended. In that manner are signets still worn in the East. See Chardin, Pietro della Valle, and other travellers. We must not however imagine that פָּתֵל here signifies a *ribband* such as we now use; it was only a *twisted string*. The Ant. interpreters understood the word in another sense, and as a separate ornament: Sep. *σμησκιον*. Vulg. *armillam*. Onk. and Syr. *הַשֵּׁט*. Tharg. *שֵׁט*, badly rendered *pallium*. Saad *שֵׁט*. Erp. *שֵׁט* †. Peric *σμησκιον*. Gr. Ven. *καλυπτρα*.

Ver. 29. *What breach is this thou hast made?* מַה פְּרִצַּת עָלֶיךָ פֶּרֶץ. The midwife was surprised at this violent and uncommon eruption: and it has been made an objection to the veracity of the fact, as being hardly possible. To shew the contrary, Michaëlis has given in his German Notes on the Bible two extracts from Professor Wrisberg, and Haller, which I subjoin in their own words. The former, who was professor of midwifery in the university of Göttingen, writes thus: "Bey einer frau auf dem lande, die wegen widernatürlicher lage des kindes bey "einer zwillings-geburth schon 48 stunden in geburtschmerzen zubebracht hatte, und die "herausgefallene hand des einen kindes ganz blau angelaufen war, wurde ich gerufen, nachdem "die hebamme, während ihrer mühsamen und doch überflüssigen beschäftigung die hand "wiederum zurück zu bringen, aus versehen die häute des anderen kindes schon zerrissen "hatte; nach deren zerreißung und darauf erfolgtem ausflusse des wassers, die in der nähe des "muttermundes liegenden füsse des anderen kindes beide in die geburt traten. Diese wurden "von mir zuerst ergriffen, und das annoch lebende kind daran herfürgezogen; worauf ich durch "die wendung das erste kind, welches mit seiner hand zuerst in die geburt getreten war, "und davon die deutlichsten beweiße durch die blaue farbe der aufgeschwollenen arme gab, "gleichfalls, wiewohl todt, zur welt brachte."—Haller's Letter to Michaëlis, dated May 2d, 1770, is as follows. "Ob der erste zwilling seine hand zurück ziehen kann?—Ich habe schon "geschrieben, blos die natur könne alles dergleichen bewirkt haben, wenn der kopf des zweiten "kindes zwischen den kopf des ersten und die mutter gedrückt wurde. Viel leichter gehet "es an, wenn man annimt, die wehmutter habe die füsse gesucht, um den ersten zwilling "zu wenden. Ist aber dieser handgriff in diesen ersten zeiten bekannt gewesen? Beym Celsus "sind spuren, bey dem angeblichen Hippokrates keine. Doch die Aegyptier, die erfinder der

* The variety in Holman's is hardly worth remarking; save that Jerom read *Enam*, more agreeable to the Hebrew letters.

† This is well rendered, and corresponds exactly with the Hebrew word. See the Root *פָּרַץ* in Castell's Lexicon.

"künste, können handgriffe gewußt haben, die in Griechenland nicht so ~~so~~ bekannt worden sind; und Aristoteles sagt, zwillinge seyn in Ägypten sehr gemein, folglich die nothwendigkeit dergleichen geburten zu befördern größer als in kältern ländern."—This remark is very pertinent; and is at least as applicable to the Hebrew women, as to the Egyptian. See the Remark on Exod. 1.—Having consulted some of the first practitioners in this metropolis, I am pleased to find that they agree in sentiment with Haller. The following letter was sent to me by Dr. Combe in 1793. "I think this (case) might naturally happen, in either of the two following positions of the children, when the mother has a large well-formed pelvis. 1st, If on the rupture of the membranes, the arm of one child be forced down with the head of the other, the hand of the first child, in a pain or two, will be even with the os externum, or a little lower: at the same time the head of the second child, occupying nearly the whole of the cavity of the pelvis, will prevent the head and body of the first child coming down: and, probably, after some ineffectual pains (the children being in this situation) the arm of the first child will, in the interval of pain, be a little drawn up; and a subsequent pain will force down the head of the second child; and thus the one who presented the hand first, will be born last.

"2dly, If, instead of the head, the breech of the second child be forced down* with the arm of the first, as before described, the event will be exactly the same."

Dr. Savage is of the same opinion; and although in his extensive practice he has not found a case similar to that of Tamar, and that mentioned by Dr. Wrisberg, yet he assures me that a German Doctor, who practised long in London, and whose name was Cobban†, had met with a case exactly similar.—Mr. Ring, whose practice is also extensive, and whose obstetric skill is unquestionable, coincides in opinion with the fore-mentioned physicians. So that, I think, the possibility of Tamar's case is indubitable.

C H A P. XXXIX.

Ver. 14. SHE called to her domestics. קָרָא לְאִשֵּׁי בֵּיתָהּ—lit. She called to the men of her house, i. e. the eunuchs who guarded her apartments; according to the eastern custom. Lobstein here again endeavours to justify the singular reading of the Genovesan ms. of the Sam. Text, which has לְאִשֵּׁי to the women, that were about her. His chief reason is that if she had addressed herself to men, she would not have said, that the young Hebrew had been brought in "to insult us" לְעִוְזָה בָּנוּ. But this appears to me a weak objection. She spoke as a woman of consequence: and this may be adduced as another example of a plural used for a singular. See the Rem. on Gen. 1. p. 8. second paragr. Or she might deem the insult offered to her guardians, as well as to herself. I therefore see no reason for admitting the Genovesan reading contrary to all the other copies, and all the Ant. versions.—The reading of this same ms. is more probable in

Ver. 20. Where the present text has וַתִּזְכֹּר אֶל־בֵּית הָאֵדֻם, the Genovesan copy has וַתִּזְכֹּר both here and in vv. 21. 22. 24. I had long suspected that this latter might have been the original

* Which seems to have been the case with Dr. Wrisberg's woman.
doubtful about the orthography of the name,

† Or Cobburn: for Dr. S. seemed
reading,

reading, before I knew that Michaëlis had had the same idea. I am now almost convinced that it is; it being the reading of not only the Genovesan, but of 10 other Sam. mss*. It might be imagined, with some degree of plausibility, that Sep. read *סור*, as they render *σχυρωμα*; or that they understood *סור* in the same sense. This sense is confirmed by the radical meaning of *סור* in Chald. Syr. and Sam. dialects; in which it denotes an *inclosed, secluded, secure* place; *arx, turris, palatium*†: and surely no word can better denote a royal prison or *bastille*; such as this prison seems to have been. I am not even sure but that the Hebrew acceptation of the word, applied to *merchandise* and *merchandising* is to be sought in the idea of *inclosing* and *securing* goods in warehouses. See the Rem. on Jerem. 14. 28. and on Ps. 38. 10. and 91. 4.—I had almost omitted to mention the derivation of Aben-Ezrah, Bochart, Jablonski, &c. who make *סור*, or *סור*, a compound of two Coptic words, *SONH* and *AREH*: of which the former signifies *vinculus*, the latter *custodia*. If the word had been found only here, I should not object to this etymon: but in general I am not for seeking Hebrew words in a language with which the Hebrew dialect has little or no affinity.

C H A P. XL.

Ver. 4. *SOME* days. *ימים*, which Bp. Law thought might be *a week*. Others make it a whole year. I have, with all the Ant. versions, expressed it indefinitely.

Ver. 6. *He saw that they were troubled*. *ועינם*. Sep. *τεταραγμενοι*. Aq. *εμβροδομενοι*‡. Our translators followed Sym. and Vulg. *σαθηντοι*, *tristes*: and so Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis.—It is not however the same word with that in the next verse, *רעם*; which, with me, they render *sad*. Sep. *σαθηντοι*.

Ver. 13. *Will decide thy fate*. Bp. Law “Will call thee to account||—bring thee to trial.” which is the very rendering of the Sam. version. The other versions either retain the Hebraism, or give it the meaning of *culling to mind*.

Ver. 15. *In a dungeon*. *בבור*. The common meaning of *בור* is *a pit, well, cistern*; but here it is to be understood in a more unlimited sense: for Joseph seems to have then been a prisoner at large, at least within the precincts of the prison-house.

Ver. 16. *Wicker-baskets*. *סלי דורי*. The last of these words is variously rendered. Sep. *αφροδισια*. Aq. *γυρως*. Sym. *βαϊναι*. Vulg. *farinae*§. Syr. *חורתא*** . Onk. *דורי*††. Tharg. *פתח נקח*‡‡. Arab. Pol. *دور*. Arab. Erp. *بور*. Persic: *سودور* *foraminous*; which I take to be the true interpretation of the Hebrew word. At any rate the word *דורי* or *ורי* can be appli-

* I mention not the single Hebr. ms. which here agrees with those Sam. copies: but which in all the other places reads *סור*.

† Perhaps of a roundish figure; whence Purver seems to have taken the fancy of rendering it a *round-boule*.

‡ So also Gr. Ven. *τεταραγμενοι*. The other Ant. versions will, likewise, bear the same meaning.

|| So also Delgado in the very same words. § So Gr. Ven. *πελανου*.

** Rendered in Pol. *ciborum candidorum*: but which, I apprehend, denotes rather the colour of the basket itself, than of the viands contained in it. Those baskets were made of *white twigs*, according to the notion of the translator: or perhaps his meaning, as well as that of Onkelos, may be *bale*.

†† Absurdly rendered *plena pane principali*. It seems rather to denote that the baskets were *plena foraminibus*: full of little interstices, as bread-baskets commonly are.

‡‡ Jerus. *דורא קקשון*.

cable only to the baskets, and not to their contents; and must be rendered either *white*, or *wicker*. Pagninus, Olcaster, Castalio, the Genevans, Le Clerc, &c. are for the former; for the latter, Jarhi, Junius, Houbigant, Dathe, and our first English translators. In the Bishop's Bible both epithets are joined "*white wycker baskets*;" but James's translators retained only the first, *white*; which Bate followed. It is rather strange that Michaëlis prefers *pastry-work*, "*back-work*."

Ver. 19. *Will decide thy fate*. After these words, in the present Hebr. and Sam. copies, we find the following word מַעֲלִיךְ; *from off thee*. Which in my Explan. Note, I have represented as an interpolation, arising from its proximity to the מַעֲלִיךְ at the end of the verse. It is wanting in one of Kennicott's mss. and was wanting at first in 2 of De Rossi's. But, on the other hand it is in all the Ant. ver. save Vulg. and I am not sure but it is there included in the word *auferet*. If it be genuine, we must here give a new meaning to the words שָׂם אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ, a meaning which I think they can hardly bear; and render "*Pharaoh will take off thy head*." But I believe, a single other instance cannot be produced, where שָׂם אֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ signifies *to take off a head*. I am therefore still inclined to think that the first מַעֲלִיךְ in this verse is a very old interpolation; borrowed from the second מַעֲלִיךְ.

C H A P. XLI.

Ver. 2. *ON a meadow*. בְּמֵדִי. Sep. *ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ**. Vulg. *in locis campestribus*. Onk. בְּמֵדִי retaining the Hebrew word. Syr. בְּמֵדִי in *viridario*. Tharg. בְּמֵדִי in *medio pratorum*†. Saad. פִּי אֶלְקֵרֶם ‡ rendered *in gramine*: but the word is by some supposed to mean that particular grass called *sainfoin*, *onobrychis*. Ar. Erp. פִּי אֶלְקֵרֶם in *prato*. Perf. דֶּר עֲלִפְרָר in *gramineto*. Gr. Ven. ἐν τῷ λειμῶνι. Thus all concur in making it either *a meadow*; or grass growing on a meadow: but some of the terms are supposed to denote a particular grass. We learn from Jerom that the word ἀγρῷ was in his time considered as an Egyptian word, which signified *omne quod in palude virens nascitur*. The Coptic translator having retained the word *abi*, with the Copt. art. *pi*; makes this more probable. It is worth remarking that in the Celtic dialect formerly spoken in Scotland *ach* was the name for a *meadow* or *field*: and makes a part of many compound proper names in that country. The Scottish *hauch* ||, and the English *haugh* §, are of the same origin.

Ver. 16. *Without God*, &c. The Text has בְּלֹא־אֱלֹהִים יַעֲנֵה, literally rendered by Pagninus, *Præter me, Deus*, &c. So the Latin Vulgate, *Abſque me*, &c. and so equivalently Onk. both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven **. But the Sam. lection לֹא יַעֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים, which was

* So Vat. and Alex. But Compl. 1 ms. and Copt. have ἀγρῷ; and Ald. and 2 mss. have ἀγρῷ. Philo too has ἀγρῷ. Jerom (Comment. in H.) read ἀγρῷ, and I have little doubt but that the original reading of the Text was מֵדִי. See the Remark on Eccius. 40. 16. † So the Latin translator of Tharg. Bab. but the translation of Tharg. Jerus. is *in medio carethorum*; although it is the same word in the Chaldee.

‡ From which, I believe, comes the Latin *pratium*; *k* in *p* mutato: and not from the ridiculous etymon of Vulpian.

|| Dipple, Dundurcas, Doonaleith, and Devay

Are the three finest *hauchs* (meadows) along the Spey.

§ As in *Wooler-haugh-head*.

** χαρισ μου.

followed by Sep. * and Syr. † appears to be by far the better reading; which I have accordingly followed in my version. Point, then, בלעדִי with a *tséré*: for there is no necessity of reading with Houbigant בל בלעדִי.—Michaëlis paraphrases thus: "This is above my power: God alone can give to the king a lucky and desirable answer."—Dathe: "Josephus vero negavit, sibi hanc inesse facultatem; interim sese vehementer optare, ut Deus ei salutaria indicet." Can this be called a *translation*?—Better Rosenmüller: "Nihil ad me: Deus respondebit pacem Pharaoni, &c." They all followed the present Masoretic reading.—But best of all, in my opinion, Houbigant: "Nemo, inquit, Pharaoni prospera nuntiare, sine Deo potest."

Ver. 34. *Take up a fifth part of the produce of the land.* חֲמִשָּׁה אֶת אֶרֶץ lit. *fifth the land*; as Secker renders; in the same manner as we say to *tithes*.

Ver. 38. *With a god-like mind.* מִשֵּׁר רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים בּוֹ. *In whom is the spirit of a god.* A pure Hebraism, denoting a superior degree of penetration and wisdom: as is well explained in the next verse.

Ver. 40. *At thy word shall all my people move.* עַל פִּיךָ יִשָּׁק בָּל עַם. Pagninus, deriving שָׁק from נָשָׁק, renders it *osculabitur*: and our Chandler was of the same opinion. But Secker justly observes that "עַל פִּי יִשָּׁק" cannot signify to kiss the mouth; but must be rendered *juxta mandatum*: but *osculari juxta mandatum* is no sense." Others, from the same root, would render it *armed*; as if Pharaoh had said: "all my people shall be *armed* at your command." The Thargums ‡, and the Greek of Venice § favour this interpretation. I derive the word from שָׁק, and take it in the meaning of *discursitare*, to be ready to run one's errand at his desire: *to move* at his pleasure: like the Centurion's servants in Matthew 8. 9. who *went*, when he said: *go!* and *came*, when he said: *come!*—Perhaps another meaning, equally probable, might be drawn from the same root שָׁק, in the sense which we give to תִּשְׁקֶט Gen. 3. 16. And so I think must Sep. be understood ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι σου ὑπακούσεται πᾶς ὁ λαὸς μου. And Vulg. *obediet*.—Rosenmüller prefers a meaning suggested by Lentz, who derives שָׁק from the Arabic שָׁק to which they give the signification of *pangere, compingere*; and then apply it metaphorically to the strict attention which the Egyptians were, by their King's order, to pay to Joseph's commands. "Per metaphoram aliquis *super* as vel *ori alterius apparatus* dicitur, qui ejus jussis perfectum obsequium præstare debet, ita ut ab ejus ore recedere seque avellere non possit. Simili quadam phrasi dicitur, *ab ore alicujus pendere*." This is quite in the manner of Schultens: that is, in my opinion, an unnecessary refinement. Were I to call in the Arabic here to aid, I would rather say, that the meaning is *ordinari*; to be always *ready* to receive orders: which would nearly fall in with our common version "be ruled."

Ver. 42. *Muslim.* שֹׁש. Forster has so ably proved this to be *cotton* (*gossypium arboreum*) that it now passes for unquestionable, among Biblical critics. See his work *On the Byssus of the Ancients*, sect. 10. p. 46.—See also Pliny, l. 19. c. 1. and Pollux's *Onomasticon*, l. 7. c. 17.

Ver 43. *Abreeb.* אֲבֵרֶךְ. That this proclamation was made in the Egyptian tongue, we cannot entertain a doubt: but we are not quite so certain, that the Hebrew historian might not have given the Egyptian word a Hebrew turn; as, in my opinion, he has done with respect to

* Ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθησεται τὸ σωτήριον Φαραὼ.

† סִבַּר אֵת וְבִלְעַד אֱלֹהִים נִעַדָּה שְׁלֹמֹה לְפָנָיו †

‡ דַּוְדָּי.

§ ὁρᾷται.

the name of *Moses*.—Yet, every thing considered, it appears more probable, that here, at least, he retained the original term; and, therefore, we are naturally led to seek its etymology and meaning in the Egyptian language. Two learned authors, Jablonski and Forster, have accordingly given their explanations of *Abrech*, from the Coptic dialect. The former makes it a compound of *OUBE contra*, and *AKK inclinare, bow towards*. The latter composes it of *HA-TRE-CHEK*; which he renders *a-rege-cinctus*: as if the royal proclamation had been to this purpose: “Behold the man whom the king hath clothed:” similar to that in *Esther*: “Thus shall it be done to the man, whom the king delighteth to honour.”—This is ingenious; but I doubt much of the justness of the etymon; although my knowledge of the Coptic is yet too insignificant to qualify me a competent judge. The other derivation pleases me much better; the more especially as we learn from Origen (in *Catenis*) that the word in question implies *genuslectio*, *γονατίξις*; which was most probably the very word used by Aquila, and not *πρυγκ*, as in *Montfaucon*. See *Bahrdr’s* edition of the *Hexapla*, t. 1. p. 252.—To the same purport the Latin Vulg. “ut omnes coram eo *genusflecterent*.” In a similar sense it was taken by Arab. *Erp.* *ARCEA*; and by *Gr. Ven.* *γονατισμεν*.—But what shall we say of the version of the Septuagint? which is as follows: *καὶ ἀναγγελεῖς* (or *ἐξαγγελεῖς*) *ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγγελεῖς*: *an herald proclaimed before him*. It is plain they either took *אברך* for a nominative agreeing with *יקרא* (for so they must have read in the sing. with *Sam.* and 3 MSS.) and considered it as equivalent to *ἀναγγελεῖς*; or omitted to translate it at all, which is hardly credible. It was their general custom, when they could not readily find a Greek equivalent, to retain the original word, as above in *אמ*, and below in *צפנת פענח*: they would, then, have given us *ἀέρας*, or some such word: if they had not looked upon *אברך* as an appellative Egyptian noun of the same meaning with *ἀναγγελεῖς* in Greek. I anxiously looked for some various reading in *Holmes*; but found not even the trace of one. Those translators, living at Alexandria, had it in their power to consult the Copts concerning the meaning of the word: and if they had not been convinced that it meant *ἀναγγελεῖς*, it is not at all probable that they would have used that term. In turning to the Coptic version, made from theirs, I find *ἀναγγελεῖς* rendered *ΑΠΙΚΤΡΙΑ*: did the translator borrow this from the Greek; or is it a real Coptic term? I have in vain looked for it in *La Croze*: but if it were a genuine Coptic word, perhaps, in the hands of a thorough Coptic scholar, it might be resolvable into our *אברך*.—Be this as it may, my great regard for the Septuagint makes me ever loth to abandon them, where their version has not been vitiated by careless copyists, or daring correctors.—With respect to the other antient translators, except the four already mentioned, they appear to have considered *אברך* not as an Egyptian, but an Hebrew compound of *אב* and *רך*: and they are generally agreed about the meaning of *אב*, but differ about the meaning of *רך*. The *Syr.* translator seems to have understood all that follows in the verse, as a part of the proclamation. *אבא ושלמא על כלה ארעה דמצרין*. But how he could draw this out of the present Hebrew Text, is to me inconceivable. For in the first place he must have considered the syllable *רך* as an useless adjunct, and either not found or suppressed, in his text, the word *אמרו*. Then, indeed, the Hebrew might be thus literally rendered: *Pater, et datus* (i. e. *constitutus*) *super omnem terram Egypti*.—On the other hand, according to some commentators, *רך* denotes a king; and consequently *אברך* signifies the king’s father; as if Joseph had, by this proclamation, been declared to be the father or guide of Pharaoh.—So it was understood by *Onkelos*: *אבא למלכא דין* *This is a father to the king*:

king: and from Jarhi we learn that כר in Syriac is a *king*. But it is not clear that either in Syr. or Chald. it had that meaning before Syria and Palestine were Roman provinces. The Thalmudists seem to have borrowed their כר or רכא from the Latin *rege*, the ablative of *rex*; or from *rex* itself, by the apocopé of *s*, of which and *k* the *x* is composed. This to me appears the more credible, as I find them elsewhere making the same apocopé in words derived from the Greek and Latin: thus אכר for αγκ, קליב *chalybs*, ידך *Judex*.—Jonathan understood כר in its common acceptation, *tener, tenellus; tender, delicate*; and this interpretation pleased a Rab. Judah (apud Jarhi*); and was adopted by Jerom, in his Q. Hebr. where he thus writes: “Mibi videtur non tam *præco*, sive *adgeniculatio*, quæ in salutando vel adorando Joseph accipi potest, intelligenda: quam illud quod Hebræi tradunt, dicentes *patrem tenerum* et hoc sermone transferri: AB quippe dicitur *pater*; RECH *delicatus*, sive *tenerrimus*; significante Scripturâ, quod juxta *prudentiam* quidem *pater* omnium fuerit; sed juxta *ætatem tenerrimus adolescens et puer*.” This is precisely the language of the Thargums רב בחכמה ורכך בשנים: “In wisdom great, although a child in years.” But this shews that the good Jerom was sometimes led into *childish* explanations by his Rabbinical tutors, against his own more critical judgment. On the whole, then, we must hold to the Coptic derivation of אברך, or say that it is here a Chaldaism for דברך, in which case it will signify *Bend the knee*. Or, perhaps, even in its present form, it might be plausibly explained *I bend the knee*, metaphorically *I bless*, or *salute*: as in French or Italian *Je vous baise la main; Vi baccio la mano; I kiss your hand*; by way of mere salutation.

Ver. 45. *And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-Paaneah*. That Joseph's new name would be Egyptian, there can be no doubt; but it may here again be questioned, whether the Hebrew historian might not accommodate that name to his own language. The Hebrew terms are צפנת-פנעא in the present Jewish copies †; and צפנת-פנעא in the Samaritan copies ‡.—Are these Hebrew or Egyptian words? The Jewish writers, in general, considered them as Hebrew; and render them by terms that mean *the discoverer of secrets*. Thus Onkelos גברא דשמך גלך ליה *the man to whom secrets are revealed*. To the same purport Jonathan and both Arabs; and Josephus in his interpretation of the name ||.—Syr. PerL and Gr. Ven. retain the original word; which in the last is thus written Σαφνῶθ Παανῆα; and in Syr. explained to be *one to whom secrets are discovered*.—The Latin Vulg. only, has *salvatorem mundi* (the saviour of the world) which Jerom in Q. Hebr. thus defends: “Licet Hebraicè hoc nomen absconditorum reperi-
torem sonet; tamen, quia ab Ægyptio ponitur, ipsius linguæ debet habere rationem: interpretatur ergo, sermone Ægyptio, *salvator mundi*; eo quod orbem terræ ab imminente famis excidio liberârit.” This interpretation was adopted by the generality of Rom. Catholic commentators; but as generally rejected by those of the Protestant communions. It has, however, lately been brought into credit again; as we shall see in the sequel.—But let us first

* For which, however, he was laughed at, by another Jew of Damascus. “Dixit ei filius Durmaskith: Quousque tu nobis detorques scripturas? non notat אברך נלך אברך *genus*; quoniam omnes ingrediebantur sub illius (Josephi) potestate.” † There is some small variety in the mss. One has פנעא for פנעא, one has פנעא in two words: one has פנעא פנעא; and one has פנעא—all probably erroneous. ‡ Three mss. have צפנת without a *jod* after פ; and this I consider as the better reading. || Σαφνῶθ γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα ΚΡΗΤΙΤΩΝ ἘΡΕΤΗΝ. Antiq. l. 2. c. 6. So Theodoret: ἀποφύγων ἐρμηνεύει; and Chrysost. τὴν κρυπτοῦ γωνίαν.

notice the singular reading of the Septuagint, *Υπομνηστικῆς* *. It is remarkable, that, in this name only they have changed into *psi* the Hebrew *tsade*; which every where else they express by *sigma*. This inclines me to believe, that they had in view the Egyptian or Coptic term: which, residing at Alexandria, they might readily learn: if, indeed, the Coptic were not their ordinary language.

This being premised, let us now see what can be said in favour of, or against, each of the above opinions.—There are two strong arguments, in my apprehension, against the opinion of those who deem the words pure Hebrew, and render them *the revealer of hidden things*. For in the first place *פִּעֻנָּה* is not Hebrew; at least it occurs no where else in the whole Hebrew Scripture; nor is it found in any other sister dialect. 2dly, Were it supposed to be an Hebrew word, and to signify *a revealer*; and that the preceding word *צִפְנֵת* meant *secret* or *hidden things*; which may readily be granted: yet still the construction would not be Hebrew; and in order to make of it a genuine Hebraism, the words must be transposed, and written thus *פִּעֻנָּה צִפְנֵת*, or *פִּעֻנָּה מַצְפֵּי*: as Gen. 37. 19. *בעל החלומות* *a master of dreams*; not *a dream-monger*, as we say in English: and Ps. 7. 10. *בוחן לבות* *searcher of hearts*, not *heart-searcher*.—In like manner, not to go out of the Pentateuch, *בִּימֵינוּ* Gen. 35. 18. *נלעד* Gen. 31. 47. *אֲדֹלֵיבִסָּח* Gen. 36. 4. *יִתְמֹד* Exod. 6. 23. *אֲדֹלֵאב* Exod. 31. 6. *בִּלְעָם* Num. 22. 5.—Some compound proper names beginning with *אֲדֹנִי*, *אֲדָר*, *אֲדָרִי* and *אֲדָרִי* are not to be accounted exceptions, as they are formed after a different manner, and are in reality reducible to the general rule.—Could I at all believe the name given to Joseph to be Hebrew, or rather by the Jewish historian converted into Hebrew; I would give the preference to the Sam. reading *צִפְנֵתִי פִּעֻנָּה*, and render it with the Sam. translator *נִלָּא מִפִּיִּי בְּמִיִּי* *what was bidden from me be hath revealed*, i. e. “interpreted my prophetic dreams!”—Here the construction would be regular, as well as the mode of nomination: and *פִּעֻנָּה* might be a quadriliteral, like *סִדְמָה*, from the Arabic *فَع*, *aperuit, pandit*.

But still I am much more inclined to believe the word, or words, pure Egyptian or Coptic; and that in Coptic the meaning is to be sought.—Forster, in the Work already quoted, makes it a compound of *SACH-PNOUTI-PA-ENEH-ICH*; which he renders *The divine scribe of the eternal Spirit*: as fanciful and far-fetched an etymology, in my idea, as ever was imagined.—Bernard, in his very learned note on Josephus†, thinks that the original Coptic name was *PSOTHOUMOUNET*: which he explains: *Arcanum ille mihi reclusit*; which exactly coincides with the Sam. reading, as I have above understood and rendered it: and this coincidence is the more remarkable, as Bernard seems not to have known that reading, or not to have attended to it.—Jablonski, in his Letter to Michaëlis‡, writes the name thus: *PSOTEMPHEHEN*||; and renders it *Salvator mundi*; the same meaning that Jerom had long before learned from the Egyptians themselves.—This is, undoubtedly, the most specious and most probable interpretation, that has yet been given; and I see no great cause for fishing in Coptic glossaries for another signification: although I have still some doubt, whether this even be the true resolution of the Hebrew word:

* There are 8 or 9 various readings in Holmes; but of very little importance: except that in 1 ms. as in Copt. the word terminates with *x* instead of *χ*; and that one ms. (75) has an additional interpretation similar to that of Vulg. *δ εστιν ουσια σιωπηλου*. † Antiq. L. 2. c. 6. ‡ In the 9th tome of *Oriental Library*, p. 202. || Compounded of *s* the article, *so*, a favour; and *emphehen*, the genitive of *eneh* *αιων*, *age*, *world*.

and perhaps some one, more deeply versed in Coptic literature than I, may yet find a more suitable etymon. I have sometimes thought it might be compounded of $\sigma\sigma\delta$, *prudence*, and $\phi\eta\eta\epsilon\phi\delta\upsilon$, *abundare, abundans*, an epithet perfectly suitable to Joseph; but I fear it is not according to the rules of Coptic composition, and lay no stress upon it.—I had almost forgotten to observe, that Scholtz * writes the Coptic name of Joseph thus: *Thophentepheneb*; or *Jophentepheneb*; but gives neither translation, nor resolution of its component parts.—The reader who is curious to see more on this subject may consult the above quoted writers, Montfaucon's note in his Hexapla, Rosenmüller's *Scholia* in Genes. and the 16th ch. of J. Gregorie's Observations.

Ib. *Potipharos*. פֹּטִיפָר. Sep. Πετεφρ: but 8 mss. have Πετεφρη or Πετεφρι; and this I take to be the genuine reading: for $\phi\eta\eta\epsilon\phi$ in Coptic, signifies *the priest*, and $\rho\eta\eta\upsilon\phi\delta\upsilon$ *the king*. He was the king or chief of the Egyptian priests. It was common with the Hebrew writers to drop a *nun* out of words which they Hebraized; and even out of their own words, for the sake of abbreviation.

Ib. After *the priest of On*, there is, in the present Heb. and Sam. Text וַיֵּצֵא יוֹסֵף מִצִּיֹּן *And Joseph went out over the land of Egypt* †; and this addition, with some small variety, is in all the antient versions, save Sep. ‡ Yet I cannot think that it stood here originally: so singularly awkward is its position: for it connects not with what precedes, nor with what follows. I have therefore rejected it among the Various Readings; as a probable interpolation.

Ver. 56. The clause which I have marked as wanting in Sep. is in 5 of Holmes's mss.

C H A P. XLII.

Ver. 1. *WHY gaze ye at one another?* לָכֵן תִּרְאוּ. I prefer this to the Sam. תִּרְאוּ (the *jod* is wanting in 1 ms.) which, however, was the reading of Syr. Jonathan, and the Perfic translator. The other antient interpreters read as we do; although they seem, at first sight, to convey another meaning. Sep. $\iota\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \rho\alpha\theta\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. Onk. תִּרְאוּ. Saad. תִּרְאוּ. Vulg. *Quare negligitis. Why this delay? why look ye idly at one another?* "Solent enim (says rightly Rosenmüller) se invicem aspicere, qui in aliqua re moras neclunt." Gr. Ven. $\tau\omega\ \chi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\ \delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon\sigma\ \theta\epsilon$. Arab. Erp. $\tau\omega\ \chi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\ \delta\epsilon\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon\sigma\ \theta\epsilon$.

Ver. 10. The words *to him*, said in my Var. R. to be wanting in Sep. are found in only one of Holmes's mss.

Ver. 30. *And took us for spies, &c.* וַתֵּקֶחַ אֶתָּנוּ כְּמַגִּילִים lit. *et dedit nos ut exploratores*. The Septuagint either read or understood the word במַגִּילִים *in custodia*, after אֶתָּנוּ; as they render $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \eta\mu\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta\varsigma$ (3 mss. $\epsilon\kappa\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta\varsigma$): and, indeed this reading has much more of the Hebrew idiom than the present: whatever pains Glaffius and others have taken to defend it. I am, even now, convinced that it was the original reading: and am sorry that I neglected

* In his Coptic Grammar, p. 3. published by Woide in 1778. † Some mss. בָּלָל מִן; and Syr. Arab. and some copies of Onk. read either בָּלָל or בָּלָל מִן; but De Rossi mistakes when he classes Sep. with them. ‡ It is found in 3 of Holmes's mss. but these, I suspect, have been retouched on the Hebrew. They are numbered 15. 82.

it when I made my Translation, which I wish to be thus rectified: "*and put us † in prison*], as "*spies*."

Ver. 11. *True men*. Sep. and Vulg. *pacific*. Better Aquila *εἰρηαι, upright, fair-dealing, honest*. Sym. *ἀπλοί*.

Ver. 15. *By the life of Pharaoh*. *וַיִּשְׁתָּבַח*. This oath in Egypt was nearly as tremendous and as common, as *אֱלֹהֵינוּ* among the Israelites. Joseph would not here swear by the latter; as that might have betrayed him.

Ver. 32. I preferred the reading of Vulg. *one father*, partly on account of the parallel place, ver. 13. and partly because *our father* sounds oddly in English. I would not, however, affirm that *אֲבִירִי* is not the genuine reading; or that even the author of the Vulg. read otherwise in his copy; as his *uno patre geniti* may be only a paraphrase. Thus Houbigant, Dathe, and Michaëlis, render as the Vulg. although they read *אֲבִירִי* in their copies.—The former uses the very words of Vulg. Dathe: *fratres unius patris*. Michaëlis: "*brüder, die einen vater hatten*."—In Holmes's Var. Read. I find that the Slavonic Ostrog. version has also *patris unius*.

Ver. 37. *Both my sons*. *אֶת שְׁנֵי בָנַי*. In ch. 46. 9. we read that Reuben had four sons, and these are said to have come with Jacob into Egypt. They must then have been born in the interval between this colloquy and Jacob's migration: or we must understand the words "*went down with Jacob*," in ch. 46. 9. 26. to be spoken proleptically: and this is the more probable, as the sons of Benjamin, to the number of *ten*, are likewise reckoned among the progeny of Jacob, who went with him into Egypt.

C H A P. XLIII.

Ver. 11. *PALM-HONEY*. So in my version I have rendered the Hebrew word *דְּבַשׁ*; after Bochart and Celsus. I am now convinced, that it is the *inspissated juice of the grape*: still called at Aleppo by the same name *ḏibṣ*, *דְּבַס*. "It has much the appearance of coarse honey, but is of a finer consistence.—It is much used by the inhabitants of *Aleppo*; is brought to town in great goat-skins, and retailed in small quantities in the bazars." Ruffel's *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 82.—See other authorities in Rosenmüller. In truth, neither common honey nor palm-honey could have been considered as a rare gift to a governor of Egypt, where palms and bees were so abundant: whereas raisin-honey, or a syrup made out of the grapes, which grew not in Egypt, might be deemed even a royal present.

Ver. 14. *But if I be bereaved*, &c. So Sophocles, Œd. Tyr. 1471. *ἀλλ' ἢ μὲν κ.τ.λ.*

Ver. 27. Although, in my version, I have rendered this verse agreeably to the reading of the present Hebrew; I am now fully convinced, that the Sam. reading *וְהָיָה* without the interrogative *ה* is the genuine lection: and that the version should be: "*Is your father, the old man whom you mentioned as being still alive, well?*" This reading must have been that of the Septuagint. For although the editors of the London Polyglott and of the Alexandrian ms. and Bos in his edition of the Vat. copy, have pointed thus the words: *πρὸς οὗτος, ὃν εἶπατε, ἐστὶ ζῇ*; and although Dr. Holmes has followed this vitious punctuation in his new edition of the Septuagint: it is certain that the Roman edition of Sixtus Quintus reads and points thus: *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, εἰ ὄντως,*

ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ πρῶτος ὁ πρῶτος, ὅν ἐπατέ, ἐπὶ ζῆ. On what authority, or for what reason, the London editors and Bos changed this punctuation, I know not; unless it were to force the Septuagint reading to speak the Hebrew reading; which after all it does in a most awkward manner. The Complutensian edition has the same reading (except that with a great number of MSS. it has πρῶτος for πρῶτος) and is thus very properly pointed: ὁ πρῶτος, ὅν ἐπατέ, ἐπὶ ζῆ;—But perhaps the Aldine edition has a still better reading, ὅν ἐπατέ ἐπὶ ζῆ; which is confirmed by not less than 21 of Holmes's MSS. and Caten. Nicet.—Two MSS. have in the same sense ὅτι ζῆ, instead of ἐπὶ ζῆ; and one has ὅτι ἐπὶ ζῆ.—All these readings, when rightly pointed, are of the same import; and the only real difference is, that the reading ζῆ has more of the Hebraism, and ζῆ more of the Greek idiom. Houbigant has elegantly rendered the passage: “Recténe est, inquit, patri vestro seni, quem superstitem esse mihi dixistis?”

C H A P. XLIV.

Ver. 5. I CANNOT but here agree with Dr. Kennicott, that the Greek * has happily preserved the words that are now wanting in both Heb. and Sam. but without which the text is lame; and must have been unintelligible to those to whom the speech was addressed †. But I cannot so readily subscribe to what the good Doctor says afterwards; namely, that there seems no authority in the original for “considering the cup used by Joseph for divination.” For I cannot think that the words כִּי יִחַשׁ נִחַשׁ נִחַשׁ can ever be rendered “Therefore he would certainly discover concerning it.”—The words cannot, in my opinion, be better rendered than they are by Sep. αὐτός δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ πρῶτος ἐπὶ ζῆ. Vulg. in quo augurari solet; and so equivalently most of the ancient versions; even Gr. Ven.—Any other interpretation would, most probably, have never been thought of, but for the purpose of freeing Joseph from the imputation of practising augury. But who will affirm, that Joseph may not have practised augury in Egypt; or, at least, made his steward address his brethren according to the prejudices of the country? The Mosaic law against divination was not yet promulgated. I allow, however, that the Hebrew will bear another interpretation; viz. Ipse autem divinatione divinatus est de eo ‡; that is, “he has found out by divination that ye have stolen it.” But this will not exculpate Joseph from the imputation of real, or pretended, divination, any more than the former version; and, indeed he calls himself an eminent diviner, v. 15.—That a cup, σκῆπτρον ||, was used in the sacred rites of Egypt, we learn from Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. p. 633. ed. Sylburg. And Lucian, somewhere, rallies the Egyptians for making a divinity of ποτήριον §. The Greeks likewise drew omens and auguries from their sacred libations. See Le Clerc's very judicious note on this passage.

* He should have added Syr. and Vulg. † “Sermones abrupti sunt (says Rosenmüller after Dathe) quoniam praesupponitur fratres Josephi facile intellecturos esse, quid sibi velit procurator.” If they did, they must have had an uncommonly quick apprehension. For what enigma is this? “Wherefore have ye rewarded evil for good? Is it not in which my lord drinketh.”

‡ Noldius has given many examples in which the prepositive 2 has the meaning of *de*; *of*, *concerning*, &c. But the most of them are resolvable into another signification, and none of them in a construction similar to the present.

§ The person who carried it in procession was called σκαλιστής. § *Ipsi* (in tabula) is represented with a cup in her hand.

Ver. 18. The speech of Judah, in this and the following verses, is in my opinion the most simple, and at the same time the most persuasive, piece of oratory that ever came from the lips of man. I have been in the habit of admiring it these forty years: yet my admiration increases every time I read it. Let my readers, who have not attended to its beauties, compare it with the phalerated harangue which Josephus substitutes for it, in his second book of Antiquities, c. vi. sect. 8. or with Steele's attempt to modernise it in one of his Tatlers*, and then say, if there be not as great a difference between them as between pure gold and glancing tinsel.

C H A P. XLV.

Ver. 1. *COULD not refrain himself, &c.* So Orestes, in Sophocles, 1180. at the moving speech of Electra: Φω! φω! κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 7. The Hebrew words לְחַיֵּיתָם לָכֶם לְפָנַי נִרְדָּה are in Sep. thus rendered: *εὐχόμενοι ὑμῶν† καταλείψον μεγαλῆν*, which might lead one to imagine that they must have read differently, and this was once my suspicion: I now believe they had the same reading before them, but gave the phrase an equipollent turn: as Jerom has done in his version: *et escas ad vivendum habere possitis*: which is still farther from the literal meaning of the Hebrew.

Ver. 10. *Thou shalt dwell in the land of Goshen, &c.* This is in ch. 47. 11. called the land of *Rameses*: but what particular region of Egypt it was, has been much disputed. That it was a country fit for pasturage, and on the eastern border of Egypt, is clear from the context: but it is not so clear what was then the eastern border of Egypt, or what were the western limits of the land of Goshen. The antient translators throw little light on the subject, as they all retain the Hebrew word; save Saadiaz, who for Goshen has גֹּשֶׁן. But in no description of Egypt have I found any such name. Stephanus has indeed a Σαδαλις, which he calls an Egyptian town: and which may have been the same with *Sadir*; for in the Arabic and Greek languages the letters *l* and *r* were interchangeable: but still the situation of *Sadalis* is as uncertain as that of *Sadir*. Perhaps, when that part of Egypt which borders on Arabia is better known, such a name or its vestiges may yet be found.—The Greek Alexandrian translators, who must have been acquainted with the geography of Egypt, have Γεσημ† Αραβίας: and it was this which partly induced Michaëlis to place *Goshen* on the side of Arabia. He thinks it extended from *Raphia* on the border of Palestine, to the vicinity of Heliopolis. To this opinion I willingly accede; but I would not carry the northern boundary farther than the *Tirbonis palus*, and extend the southern boundary as far as *Mons Troicus*.—With respect to the name itself, I am inclined to think that the reading of Sep. Γεσημ, גשם, is the original reading: which the latter Jews Chaldaized into גשן, or גשן||. Were it certain, as I think it highly probable, that this part of Egypt were favoured with heavenly showers§; I should have little hesitation in affirming that גשם is the true reading. The *land of Geshem* would then be very properly denominated:

* See a sensible remark on this subject in *Commentaries and Essays*, vol. i. p. 279.

† Compl. and 4 mss. have

ὑμῶν. ‡ Only one ms. has Γεσημ. The Latin copies before Jerom had also *Geshem*. See the next note but one.

|| None of the oriental versions have the word written with a *vau*, although the punctators have, from Hebrew analogy, inserted a *bolem* or some equivalent vowel-point.

§ See Harmer, vol. 4. p. 354, &c.

namely a *land of rain* *; in contradistinction to the rest of Egypt, which was watered by the Nile: and this *land of rain* was a proper habitation for the Israelites, who were shepherds, and not agriculturists: It is remarkable that Heliodorus calls at least a part of this tract *βουβαλιον* or places fit for pasturage.

Ib. *That thou mayest be near to me, &c.* Whether Memphis, or Tanis, or, as I once thought, Heliopolis, were then the capital and royal city of Egypt, the land of Goshen might well be said to be nigh to it, as in all probability the pasturage ground reached, or very nearly reached, to the most eastern branch of the Nile on the north, and perhaps to On, or Heliopolis, on the south. Comp. Exod. i. 22. Besides the word *near*, which might be rendered *nearer*, may be understood comparatively, with respect to the far greater distance of Chanaan.

Ver. 18. *The best of all the land of Egypt.* That is, the most proper for you, as shepherds: not the most fertile part of the country, as is generally supposed. *Better* and *worse* are relative terms: and what would have been the *worst* of the land for Egyptian farmers, was the *best* for the nomadical Israelites.

Ver. 19. *This, also, thou hast my command to bid them do.* The present Text runs thus: עשׂו כדבר ה' וקראו את ישראל, rendered by Pagninus "Et tu iussus es: hoc facite;" and by our English translators: "Now thou art commanded, this do ye." I very much doubt of the propriety of this phraseology and punctuation. The Septuagint seem to have read in their copy קרא or קראו, and to have considered קרא as governed by it: Συ δε ενταλαί τούτους λαβειν αυτοις, κ.τ.λ. The same reading, or perhaps קראו, seems to have been that of Syr. and the Thargumists: so also equivalently, although more briefly, the Latin Vulg. "Præcipe etiam, ut tollant plaustra, &c.—The Sam. copy reads קראו without any variety of lection; and if it had also read קראו for קראו, I should have been inclined to deem this the genuine text "Lo! I command: this do ye, &c." Perhaps the original reading was קראו; which is equivalent to קרא or קראו; and which may have been the reading which Sep. found in their copy.—At any rate, the meaning is fully expressed in my version; and as literally as the idiom of our language permits.

Ver. 26. *His heart palpitated.* לבן לב. The common rendering is "his heart fainted." Sep. *עצבון רב* *diavonia*.—Onk. Saad. and Perf. have terms that denote *hesitation*; no improper idea of Jacob's case.—Michælis: "Sein herz blieb aber kalt," *friguit cor ejus*; a meaning adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller; supported by the Syr. version; and from a meaning which לבן has in the Syr. and Arabic dialects. But I cannot think that the news of Joseph's being alive would *chill* the heart of Jacob. He might doubt, he might hesitate: but he could not be cold. I am persuaded, then, that the signification of לבן is to be sought in the Arabic لب, which gives the very meaning wanted; namely that of *sudden motion, palpitation*. Not badly, therefore, the Vulgate: "Quasi de gravi somno *evigilatus*; tamen non credebatur eis."

* Jerom saw this, although the etymology did not please him; because, prepossessed in favour of his Hebrew, he deemed the reading of Sep. an error. "Hic (says he, Q. Hebr.) *Arabia* additum est: in Hebræis enim voluminibus non habetur: unde et error increbuit, quod terra *Gessen* in Arabia sit. Porro si, ut in nostris codicibus est, per extremum = scribitur GESEM (quod mihi nequaquam placet) terram signat completam. GESEM enim in imbrebus vertitur."

† Five mss. have קראו: 4 have קראו: 1 has קראו: and 1 קראו.

‡ Compl. and 17 mss.

have *avrouca*. || Alex. and 8 mss. have *diavonia*.

C H A P. XLVI.

Ver. 21. I HAVE said in Expl. N. that there is much confusion in the various genealogies from Benjamin. I have made some feeble attempts to reconcile them, at least in some respects, in my Critical Rem. on 1 Chron. 26. 38. I shall at present only observe that the ten names here mentioned are not probably the immediate sons of Benjamin: and perhaps the order in Sep. is preferable to that in the Hebrew. — I now only desire that *Abi* and *Rosh* may be joined by a hyphen; as I believe them to be but one person.

Ver. 27. The addition in the Septuagint of *five* more persons, than are in the Hebrew, has been considered as an interpolation from Chronicles; chiefly, I believe, on the authority of Jerom; whose reasoning on the subject is, however, not very just*. On the other hand, it has been defended on the authority of Luke, as if Luke, or rather Stephen, *an inspired evangelist*, or *protomartyr*, could not be wrong in his supputation. But this is in itself a feeble argument; and thus refuted by the same Jerom: “Quod si e contrario nobis opponitur, quomodo, in Actibus Apostolorum, in concione Stephani dicatur apud populum, *Septuaginta quinque animas ingressas esse Egyptum*; facilis excusatio est. Non enim debuit S. Lucas, qui ipsius historiarum scriptor est, in gentes Actuum Apostolorum volumen emittens, contrarium aliquod scribere adversus eam Scripturam quæ jam fuerat gentibus divulgata: et utique majoris opinionis, illo dumtaxat tempore, Septuaginta interpretum habebatur authoritas, quam Lucas, qui ignotus et vilis, et non magnæ fidei in nationibus ducebatur.” Yet even here the father’s reasoning is more specious than solid. For the question is not, whether Luke quoted the Sep. or not: but whether Stephen in his speech to the Jews used that version. If he used the Sep. version, in speaking to Palestine Jews, it is a strong presumption that its computation was then acknowledged to be right: and indeed, I see not why it may not be here as right, as the Hebrew computation is with respect to the sons of Benjamin: for surely we must admit a *prolepsis* with regard to them also; unless we affirm that they were born before Jacob went into Egypt.

Ver. 28. *To make him meet him in Goshen.* The present Hebrew Text has לִפְנֵי נֹשֵׂא; which Pagninus renders *ad præparandum ante se Goshen*: and our translators “to direct his face unto Goshen:” and still more literally Ainsworth, “to signify before him unto Goshen.” — The Sam. reading is not לִקְרֹאת, as Rosenmüller has it; but לִדְרֹאת, which was also the reading of the Syr. translator’s copy; and perhaps that of Sep. and Onk. although they rendered not so literally. Michaëlis imagined, from the version of Sep. συναντησάμενοι αὐτῷ, that they read לִקְרֹאת, and is not unwilling to deem this the true reading: but to see one another being equivalent to meet, they might have read with Sam. which, with Houbigant and Dathe, I have followed in my version.

* See Q. Hebr. vol. ii. p. 543.

† Eight mss. have לִדְרֹאת; 4 have לִקְרֹאת, and 6 have לִדְרֹאת.

C H A P. XLVII.

Ver. 12. *IN proportion to the number of their families.* לִפְיֵי הָרִאשׁוֹת, *ad os parvuli.* Sep. κατὰ σῶμα *. *Vulg. singulis.* Dathe: *pro numero capitum.* We might say, *according to the number of mouths.*

Ver. 21. *And the people be reduced into servitude.* I follow the Sam. lection דַּעֲבֹד אֹתוֹ לַעֲבָדִים. Sep. τὸν λαὸν κατεδούλωσάτο αὐτῷ † εἰς παιδᾶς. *Vulg. subjecitque eam Pharaoni, et cunctos populos ejus ‡.*—I have no hesitation in preferring this reading, which the context seems to require, to the present Hebr. דַּעֲבֹד אֹתוֹ לְעָרִים *be removed them to cities.* See Houbigant's Prolegomena and Notes; and what has been urged against him by Ravius.—See also an excellent Note in *Commentaries and Essays*, vol. 1. p. 280.

Ver. 31. *And Israel bowed himself, leaning on his staff.* What thanks are not due to the Septuagint, for preserving here, as in many other places, the true sense of the original! The Text runs thus וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל רִאשׁוֹ הַמִּטָּה, which is commonly rendered: "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." *Vulg. Adoravit Israel Deum, conversus ad lectuli caput;* or as Jerom more briefly in Q. Heb. *Adoravit Israel ad caput lectuli;* on which he comments thus: "Quod scilicet, postquam ei juraverat filius, securus de petitione quam rogaverat, adoravit Deum contra caput lectuli sui. Sanctus, quippe, et Deo deditus vir, oppressus senectute, sic habebat lectulum positum, ut ipse jacentis habitus absque ulla difficultate ad orationem esset paratus."—And this sort of reasoning has been adopted by most modern interpreters. Yet it is all a pure begging of the question. For it is not said that Jacob was in bed, or even indisposed, when he sent for Joseph. His last sickness is only announced in the next chapter. Nor is it at all probable that the adoration paid to Joseph || was made in bed: the word יִשְׁתָּחוּ admits not such a position. Whereas an old feeble man making an obeysance on the top of his patriarchal staff, or *scapula* הַמִּטָּה, is quite natural; and no translator could better express the meaning of the whole comma than the Septuagint have done. Καὶ προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκρον τῆς ῥαβδου αὐτου. Every word of the original is in favour of this version; and nothing against it but a different mode of pointing the word הַמִּטָּה.

C H A P. XLVIII.

Ver. 12. *THEY bowed themselves.* So the Sam. וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ, and so Sep. προσεκύνησαν, and Syr. סִכְרוּ; a more probable reading than the present Text וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ, and justly preferred by Michaëlis and Dathe, whose version of the whole verse is: *Tum recedere eos paululum jubet Josephus, ut submisce avum venerarentur.*—After the young lads have received their grandfather's benediction, Joseph withdraws them from between Jacob's knees, and makes them pay their reverence to him. The other versions read in the sing. and consequently apply the term to Joseph.

* Gr. Ven. literally κατὰ σῶμα τὸ νῆπιον.

† Compl. with 8 mss. εἰς αὐτῶν.

‡ The other versions and

Josephus read as the present Hebr. and are followed by Dathe and Michaëlis.

is another *petitio principii*.

|| For that it was paid to God;

Ver. 15. *The God who hath tended me.* As a shepherd tends his flocks, וְהָאֱלֹהִים דִּרְעָה אִמִּי. So the Psalmist, 23. 1. "The Lord is my shepherd."—Mankind are wont to borrow their metaphors chiefly from their own professions. Hence so many allusions in the Hebrew writings to a pastoral life.

Ver. 19. *But the younger shall be greater, &c.* It is justly remarked by Rosenmüller, that this *prophetical benediction* (as he calls it) was not fulfilled in the time of Moses: as in the two musters made by him the tribe of Manasseh was considerably more numerous than that of Ephraim. It must therefore be referred either to the times of the Judges, when the tribe of Ephraim seems to have rivalled, in some sort, the tribe of Judah; or to the days of Rehoboam, when they became the commanding tribe of the other ten, which then separated themselves from the house of David.—The division of the Manassehites into two half tribes, might also contribute to the inferiority of both.

Ver. 22. *One portion.* שְׂכֵם אֶחָד. Some interpreters, among whom is Michaëlis, make this portion to be the place of *Sichem*, which Jacob's sons destroyed on account of the rape of their sister: and which might be denominated a *conquest* with respect to Jacob. Against this it has been objected, 1mo. That it is not probable that Jacob would call this a just conquest, since he every where else abominates the deed of his sons. 2do. That *Sichem* belonged not to the *Amorites*, but to the *Hevites*.—Neither of these objections is formidable. For, in the first place, although Jacob disapproved of the fraud and violence of Simeon and Levi, he might still consider *Sichem* as a conquest. He most certainly winked at his son's proceedings; and seems to have been more solicitous about his own safety, than concerned for the slaughter of the *Sichemites*. See ch. 35. 30. And he had surely as good a claim to the ground where *Sichem* stood, as he had to the "herds and flocks, the little ones and the wives" of its inhabitants. Ib. v. 28. 29. As then we read of no other conquest made by Jacob, we have a right to suppose that this is that here alluded to: and we actually find *Sichem* and its environs a part of the inheritance of the *Josephites*. Notwithstanding all this, I would not with Michaëlis, and even on the authority of Sep*. (whom I am always loth to abandon) insert *Sichem* in the Text; because I am persuaded that שְׂכֵם is here not a proper name, but an appellative noun, whether we derive it from the Arab. שִׁכְם *a gift*, or the Hebr. שִׁכְם *a shoulder*. Yet still, I think, it alludes to *Sichem*; to a part of which Jacob had a fair claim by purchase, ch. 34. 19.—and where the bones of Joseph were interred, Josh. 24. 32.—As to the objection arising from the name of *Amorites*, we know that this was a much more extensive name than that of *Hevites*, and might include the latter. If this satisfy not; we must suppose that, after the flight of Jacob from *Sichem*, some *Amorites* tribe took possession of the place, and were afterwards expelled by Jacob: although we no where read of that expulsion. See my Explanatory Note.

* Εγώ δε δίδωμι σοι Σικίμα, εξαίρετον ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.—Better Gr. Ven. Εγώ δ' ἔδωκα σοι μερίδα μίαν, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

CHAP. XLIX.

ALTHOUGH this chapter has had more commentators than perhaps any other single portion of Hebrew Scripture, it must be confessed that it has not hitherto been illustrated so satisfactorily, as to exclude further elucidation. In these Remarks I shall less indulge myself in criticising my predecessors, than in endeavouring to defend my own Version : which I have made, regardless of system, and, I think, devoid of every sort of prejudice. But, first of all, I must declare that I do not believe it to be the real composition of Jacob, but of some Hebrew bard, who lived posterior to Joshua, perhaps posterior to David. That Jacob may have blessed his children, and accommodated his respective benedictions to the known bent and disposition of each, is highly probable : but that he should accord his benedictions to the future situation of the tribes, will not readily be believed by those who have critically and philosophically examined the subject*.

Ver. 3. There is no difficulty, or dispute, with respect to the first comma : but the second, which I render "the prime of my might," is in the Latin Vulg. "*principium doloris mei,*" *the beginning of my sorrow*. But this rendering has been abandoned by most interpreters ; and is indeed unsuitable to the context. Syr. Chald. Perf. Ar. Erp. and Gr. Ven. all took מַּנְיָ for *strength*. And Sep. has equivalently, though figuratively, אַרְחָי תַּעֲזָוֶנִי † מוֹנִי. Jacob was in the vigour of his life, when he begot Reuben : and to this all the epithets evidently allude. The next colon מִן מַנְיָ שָׂאָה רֵעוּבֵן is still more variously interpreted. Sep. σκληρος φερσθαι, και σκληρος αυδαης : a meaning of which, in my apprehension, the Hebrew words are not susceptible.—Vulg. "prior in donis, major in imperio ;" and so Matthew "chief in receiving, and chief in power," i. e. the chief portion of his father's goods, and the chief dominion among his brethren : and this I take to be the virtual meaning of the words ; although not their literal import : "superior in dignity, superior in power," for this last word is here more proper than *strength* ; which stands in my Version. Most of the Ant. interpreters coincide in this meaning : although some of them are too wild paraphrases, particularly Onkelos and the Targums. The sense is not badly expressed by Gr. Ven. περισσους του αιδου, περισσους τε κραταιων.

Ver. 4. *Like water, thou hast lapsed*. In the preceding verse Jacob expresses in strong terms what Reuben was, or should have been by nature and birth : in the present he paints his degraded condition, and the cause of it, in lively colours. The present Text reads thus פָּחוּ כֶּסֶם מִן מַנְיָ : but with Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, Durell, &c. I prefer the Sam. read. פָּחוּת, which was that of almost all the Ant. interpreters ; although they considerably differ in its meaning. Sep. Effusus es, Vulg. "Effusus es," and so equivalently Syr. Onk. Perf. which, I have no doubt, is the genuine meaning. All Reuben's former preeminence lapsed away like

* "Non probabile est, carmen hoc iisdem verbis, quibus in hoc capite continetur, coram filiis recitatum esse a Jacobo moribundo. Sine dubio unus filiorum Jacobi, aut alius quidam, summam eorum, quæ prædixerat senex Jacobus, in carminis hujus formam redegit, ut hujus prædictionis memoria in posteros perflaret ; atque ipsi horum dictorum memoriam recitatione recolere possent." Schultze in locum.—This is granting much ; but, in my opinion, not enough. See J. H. Heinrichs *De Auctore atque Ætate Capituli Genf. xlii.* Gotting. 1790.

† Compl. and 2 mss. תַּעֲזָוֶנִי.

water, when he defiled his father's couch. Some moderns give another meaning to פָּתַח derived from the Arabic; namely "Thou hast swelled like water," i. e. *tumultuisti inflar aquarum*: which nearly corresponds with the ἐξέπρασ of Sep.—Michaëlis is, I believe, singular in his version, "Du bist rasend unfinnig geworden."—*Thou art become furious and mad!*—Those who prefer the present Hebr. reading may render with our common translation: *unstable* (or *light*) *as water*, &c. *Fugax ut aqua*. See my Explan. Note.

lb. *Then wast thou degraded, when thou ascendedst my couch.* מִן חִלְתִּי עִצִּי עָלָיו. Which Paginus thus barbarously translates: *Tunc polluisti, stratum meum ascendit*; and our Translators: "Then defiledst thou it: he went up to my couch;" and in the margin, "my couch is gone," which if any one understand without a violent commentary, I shall much wonder.—Let us now see how the antients have succeeded. Sep. τοις ἐμαυτοῦ τῆς στρωμνῆς, οὐ αὐτῆς. Vulg. has only: *Et maculasti stratum ejus*. The other versions are embarrassed and ambiguous: except that the Samaritan and Saadias lead to the right reading of חִלְתִּי, which is here in a passive signification and should be thus pointed חִלְלִית *profanatus es*: Then read עָלָיו or עָלָה; and the literal version will be, *Tunc profanatus es, cubile meum ascendens*, which I have equivalently expressed in my version.

Ver. 5. *Who accomplished their iniquitous machinations*; כָּל חֲסֵס מַכְרֹתֵיהֶם, which our Translators render, "Instruments of cruelty are in their habitation:" and in the margin, "Their swords are weapons of violence." Purver: "Whose bargains were with instruments of violence." Green: "Their engagements were instruments of cruelty." All these endeavoured to make some sense or other out of the present Hebrew. But the Sam. copy has בָּלוּ, not כָּל; and so read Sep. συνετελεσαν ἀδουαν ἐξαίρετως * αὐτῶν, and so Onk. עָבְרוּ. This reading, with Durell, Dathe, Houbigant and Michaëlis, I prefer; and have rendered accordingly.

lb. *Their iniquitous machinations*. Lit. "the iniquity of their machinations"—or "stratagems" as Durell renders. The word occurs but once, and has been variously translated: "But of all the interpretations of it (says Durell) that of *habitation* is the least justifiable: for there is no sufficient authority for that signification; which at best makes but a bad sense; and has the inconvenience (in common with the next to be mentioned) that there must be a preposition supplied. The sense of *swords* (continues the same judicious writer) given to it is borrowed from the Chald. מַכְרֹת, which the Rabbins having evidently borrowed from the Greek μάχαιραι; it cannot for that reason be admitted." To all this I heartily subscribe—and have only to add, that the meaning of *espousals* or *affiances* given to מַכְרֹת by Le Clerc, and adopted by Dathe, is in my opinion inadmissible. I would not however derive the word from either the Ethiopic or Arabic. I think the meaning is easily drawn from the Hebrew כָּרָה *fodere*; but in a metaphorical and poetical sense. Thus the Psalmist, 57. 7: כָּרָה לִפְנֵי שִׂדְחוֹ.—*They dug a pit for me*, i. e. they laid snares.

Ver. 6. *They massacred men.* וְדָרְסוּ אִישׁ. The word אִישׁ is in the singular: but, as Durell well observes, it "is frequently used for any number of men; though it is nearly a matter of indifference, which of the two numbers we here adopt. The singular answers more exactly

* Ald. Alex. and 8 of Holmes's MSS. read ἐξ ἀπειροῦς.

“to *chief* in the next line; but the plural represents in a stronger light the murder of all the “males” of Sichern, here alluded to. So Dathe: *viros trucidarunt*; and Michaëlis: “*männer*.” So before them, Sep. *ἀνδράποδας*.

Ib. *Extirpated a chief*. The Hebrew is עָקַר שׁוֹר, which is rendered by Sep. *ἐκσυνέλασαν τὸν ταύρον*, *They ham-strung, or boughed, a bull* *. Vulg. *suffoderunt murum*. And this is the meaning most generally affixed to שׁוֹר. Herder and some others have defended the Septuagint version thus: A *bull* is not here a *real bull*, but a metaphor denoting a *chief*; in contrast with שׂוֹר the vulgar *man* †. Teller imagined that שׁוֹר, in the sense of a *wall*, might have a similar metaphorical meaning ‡. I would rather, with Durell and Houbigant, either read שָׂר, or give to שׁוֹר the same signification; namely a *prince* or *chief*, designating here the *chief* of the Sichernites.

Ver. 10. We are now come to a passage, on which more labour has been bestowed than perhaps on any other passage of the Bible. It has been generally considered by Christians, at least from the days of Origen, as relating to Jesus Christ, the *Messiah*. But were this the case, it is strange that neither Christ himself, nor any of his apostles, should ever have thought of its application. Indeed this has long appeared to me, to be one of those groundless assumptions, for which there is not the slightest proof; as, I trust, I shall be able to shew in the sequel of this Remark.

As the explanation of the whole passage chiefly depends on the meaning of one word, שִׁלֹּה, SHILOH; let us endeavour to find that meaning. And first, let us see how the word has been rendered by the antient interpreters.—Sep. *τα ἀποκεῖμενα αὐτοῦ*, in the four printed editions, and in most of the Greek Fathers: but 3 mss. with Copt. have *δ ἀποκεῖται αὐτοῦ*. Seven have only *δ ἀποκεῖται αὐτοῦ*: and 15 mss. in the Text, and 3 in the margin, have *ὃ ἀποκεῖται*; which, according to Justin Mart. and some other Greek Fathers, was the original reading of Sep. and rendered by the Latins *cui repositum est*, or *cui reservatum est* ||. This was also the reading of Aquila and Symmachus.—Syr. *כִּי דִּילִיָּהּ דָּא* *to whom it (the sceptre) belongs*.—Onk. *מְשִׁיחָא דְּדִילִיָּהּ דָּא*—*The Messiah, whose is the kingdom*. So equivalently both the Thargums and Perf.—Saadias *אֱלֹהֵי דָּא*, in the same meaning with Syr.—Arab. *Erp.* and *Gr. Ven.* retain the Hebrew word שִׁלֹּה, *שלח*.—Singular is the rendering of the Latin Vulgate: *qui mittendus est*, “who is “to be sent.” The translator seems to have read in his copy שִׁלֹּחַ or שְׁלַח; a *Heib* for a *He*: and this reading was preferred by Helvicus, Grotius, and some others: but is now generally given up; even by the Roman Catholic interpreters.—Let us next see how the moderns have acquitted themselves.

They may be divided into two classes—Those who consider the word שִׁלֹּה as a compound, and those who deem it a radical, or simple derivative.—It is not my intention to give a

* So our first translators, *boughed on ox*; and the marginal reading of our public version, *boughed oxen*. But what probability is there that Simeon and Levi would bough their own prey, to be avenged of the Sichernites?—It is, however, remarkable, that Gr. Ven. has *ἀντὶ τῶν αἰχμῶν σου*. † This is the more plausible, as *שׂוֹר* has the same

double meaning. But still it accords with my interpretation. ‡ As Hector might be called the *wall*, or *bulwark*, of Troy: and Achilles the *wall* of the Greeks—*Graius murus Achilles*.

|| There are some other varieties, which the reader, if he please, may see in Holmes's Collection.

§ Or *anointed*.

minute detail of all the writers who have commented upon the passage; nor all the various systems that have been invented to illustrate it: I will only give a brief account of the present state of the question; with respect to the two classes of interpreters just mentioned.

Those of the first class, who think that שִׁלֹּה, שִׁלָּה, or שִׁלָּו, is the same with שִׁלָּו, and that שִׁלָּו is composed of ש (the abbreviation of אֶשֶׁר) and לוֹ the dative of the third personal pronoun; coincide in their interpretation with most of the ancient translators, and render either *cujus est*, or *cui est*; supplying either *sceptrum*, or *regnum*, or *jus*, or some such word: as if the meaning of the comma were “until he come, whose the sceptre, or kingdom, or right is:” or “to whom the sceptre, kingdom or right appertaineth.” And this the Jews generally apply to David; the Christians as generally to Jesus Christ.

This hypothesis, or mode of interpretation, is neatly abridged by the writer of *Commentaries and Essays*, vol. 1. p. 281, who sums up his arguments thus: “The *jod* being excluded from שִׁלָּה, and the *vau* restored, we shall have the proper pronoun masculine שִׁלָּו, compounded of אֶשֶׁר לוֹ; and the sense of the passage will be: ‘The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet (from among his posterity) until he come whose (i. e. the sceptre) is’ or ‘to whom it belongs,’ agreeable to the version of the old *Kam—*אֶשֶׁר לוֹ.”

To this it has been objected that the abbreviation of אֶשֶׁר into ש was unknown in the time of Moses, there not being another example of it in the whole Pentateuch, if we except the contested בִּשְׁמֹךְ of Gen. 6. 3. To me, who am persuaded that the last words of Jacob were put into their present poetical garb long after Moses, this is no great objection. The abbreviation in question is found in the book of Judges, not only in poetry, but also in prose. See Jud. 5. 7.—7. 12.—8. 26.—But there are other objections which militate more powerfully against this explanation. 1^{mo}. The reading שִׁלָּו is supported by only 3 mss. and these even have not שִׁלָּו but שִׁלָּו. That the ך and ך, from their great resemblance in the old Hebrew characters, have been by ignorant or careless transcribers frequently interchanged, is certain: but that the ancient Hebrews ever used the masculine and feminine pronouns indiscriminately, is alleged without sufficient proof. In the Sam. copy of the Pentateuch there is not, I think, a single instance. And, indeed, it is my firm belief, that wheresoever in the Hebrew text we find ך for ך as an affix, or *vice versa*, it is a corruption: whatever Buxtorf and his disciples may urge to the contrary. But, 2^{do},

Were it even granted that שִׁלָּה and שִׁלָּו, or even שִׁלָּה and שִׁלָּו without the *jod*, were the same; and that שִׁלָּו were an abbreviated compound of אֶשֶׁר לוֹ, such an *ellipsis*, as must here be admitted, is not, I think, to be found in the whole Scripture. The instance from Ezekiel, 21. 27. is not to the purpose; for there the nominative מֶלֶךְ makes the sentence complete and the meaning clear: and to say that the nominative to מֶלֶךְ is here to be taken from the preceding comma, is to beg the question. Besides, the meaning arising from this interpretation, if the passage be applied to Christ, is inadmissible, as Rosenmüller properly remarks. “Quod sensus efficientur, qui nullo modo admitti potest: reges enim Israelitarum à tribu Judæ orti multa ante Christum natum sæcula defierunt: et postquam Israelitæ sese à Persarum et Græcorum po-

* So also Michaëlis: “dem es gebührt.” and Green: “until he, whose right it is, shall come.”

"testate liberaverunt, habebant illi reges è tribu Levi; et post eos adeo regem peregrinum nacti sunt, Herodem Magnum, quo regnante natus est Jesus. Hi omnes reges ne in urbe quidem in tribu Judæ sitâ, sed Hierosolymæ in tribu Benjamin, sedes habebant."—Accordingly,

The Jewish interpreters, who take שִׁלֹה to be the same with שָׁלוֹ, apply it, with greater propriety, to David, who was the first king of the tribe of Judah: for the words כִּי עַד imply not *discontinuance*, but only *the arrival of an event*: as we shall see more plainly afterwards.

Others make שִׁלֹה, i. e. (say they) שָׁלוֹ, a compound of שַׁל *gifts* and לוֹ *to him*: as if the meaning of the Text were "until he come, to whom gifts *are due*," So Jarhi, who, however, calls it a *mystical exposition*, and prefers the interpretation of Onkelos.

Le Clerc imagined that שִׁלֹה was a compound of שָׁל, from the Chald. שָׁלַח *finire*, and of הָ for ו; and rendered "donec veniat finis ejus: i. e. *Judæ*:" a version justly objected to by Houbigant; and ridiculed by the Jews of Metz. "Our holy patriarch (say they) if we believe M. Le Clerc, was filled with the spirit of prophecy, to teach us, *That Judah was to have the sovereign power, until—he should not have it*."—Indeed Le Clerc, as far as I know, made no proselytes to his opinion.

Durell, supposing that *Judah* here means not the *patriarch* of the tribe, but the *land* of Judah, and שִׁלֹה to be a compound of שָׁ (for שָׁן), and הָ, the dative of the feminine affix, renders the whole verse thus:

"The sceptre shall not depart from *the land* of Judah,

"Nor a leader from her standards*,

"Before He come who *belongeth* to her:

"And him shall the nations obey."

By this mode of interpretation the solecism is evidently removed; but a meaning is forced upon the Text, which, in my opinion, it cannot bear. To confound *Judah* with the *land* of *Judah* is here preposterous: and such an expression could not, with any degree of propriety, be put in the mouth of Jacob, even by poetical licence.

Ludovicus-de-Deo imagined that שָׁל, from the Arabic, ought to be rendered *profuvium*: and thus שִׁלֹה, for שָׁלוֹ, will be *profuvium ejus*; that is, *his issue*.

Come we now to those interpreters, who consider שִׁלֹה as a radical term, or as a simple derivative.

Aben-Ezrah, the most learned and acute of all the Jewish commentators, took שִׁלֹה to be the name of the place, where the Convention-tent or Tabernacle was erected after the conquest of Chanaan, Josh. 18. 1. and renders the comma thus: "until Shiloh be at an end; or cease to be." For then, says he, David reigned. Delgado turns the same idea another way: his version of the whole verse is: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, *until Shiloh be gone down*; and even then he shall have an assembly of people"—which he thus explains: "Judah having the ruling-staff in his hand, continued in that prerogative till the ark of the Lord was taken by the Philistines, when the tabernacle of Shiloh was put down. Then the command was taken from Judah, and he may be said to

* He follows the Sam. reading.

"have couched as a lion, as in ver. 9. and soon after the restoration of the ark, a king was chosen of the tribe of Benjamin, which was Saul: yet then, even during Saul's reign, David sprang up; and was privately elected king by Samuel; and being pursued by Saul, a company of men assembled to him, whose number soon increased to 600. And, perhaps, the end of this verse may allude to that event."—Certainly ingenuity is not here wanting, whatever we may think of the writer's system.

The learned Teller is also of opinion that שִׁלֹה is here the name of a place; but makes it, not the nominative, but the objective case: and renders, *usque dum venerit Schiluntem*.—"until he come to Shiloh." This is a very specious version. The want of the final ך denoting motion to a place is no objection. It is frequently omitted; and even in the very same word, and with the very same verb, 1 Sam. 4. 12. וַיָּבֹא שִׁלֹה "and came to Shiloh."—Doctor Priestley, I remember, was so pleased with this interpretation, that he was convinced it was the only true one.

It did not please Hufnagel, who in Eichhorn's *Biblical Repertory** labours to prove that the words יָבֹא שִׁלֹה should be rendered *quia venit amans*; or, as he expresses it in German, "because with love he [Judah] begins his course†." His argument in favour of this version is, that Jacob having given reasons for his predictions to Reuben, and to Simeon and Levi, drawn from their respective merits and dispositions, it is not probable that he would not, in like manner, qualify his prediction to Judah. This appears to me a very weak argument. In qualifying with a *wherefore* his predictions to Reuben and to Simeon and Levi, Jacob appeals to known facts; whereas we nowhere read that Judah's love for his father was more conspicuous than that of Joseph, or of any other of his brethren. If any pre-eminence of this kind were to be implied from facts, it would seem to belong to Reuben: for he alone laboured to rescue Jacob's beloved son, and to restore him to his father; when all his other brothers were plotting his destruction‡. All the length that Judah's love on this trying occasion went, was to commute the *death* of Joseph into *slavery*.

Besides, in order to form his version, Hufnagel wrests from the words unusual meanings, contrary to grammatical analogy, and the rules of Hebrew syntax. For in the first place, יָבֹא never signifies, cannot signify *propterea, because*. Secondly, he affixes a meaning to שִׁלֹה which cannot be drawn from it, whatsoever way it be pointed (he points שִׁלֹה) or from whatsoever root it be derived. Lastly, *quia venit amans*, in the sense annexed to it by Hufnagel, is, in my apprehension, an expression so harsh and unidiomatical, that this alone would make me reject his interpretation.

According to some modern commentators, שִׁלֹה here is the same with שִׁלִּית in Deut. 28. 57. and both from the Chald. שִׁלֹה or the Arabic סִלִּי; which denote either the *secundines*, or the *membrane* that incloses the foetus: but here taken for the *foetus* itself: a noble metonymy, truly! either with respect to Judah or his offspring. "The sceptre shall not depart, &c. until "the *secundines* come."—I wonder how this etymon could be adopted by Dathe||; who, however,

* Tom. xiv. p. 235, &c.

† Denn er beginnt mit Liebe seinen Lauf.

‡ See Gen. 37. 22. 30.

|| "Vera scriptio vocis adeo controversa est שִׁלֹה sine *Yod*. . . Est autem ab Arabico סִלִּי, quod notat membranam, quam involutus

ever, gives a new turn to the comma, by giving a new meaning to עַד־כִּי, which he renders *quamdiu*; as long as. "Quamdiu prolem habebit, ei gentes obedient."

Luther, Castalio, Oleaster, Houbigant, and some others, more rightly in my opinion, derive the word from שָׁלוֹם *prosperity, tranquillity, happiness*; and render *quietus, pacificus, sospitator, pacificator, tranquillator*, or some similar term: all epithets applicable, say they, to Christ, or the Messiah; *the author of peace, tranquillity, and happiness*. Schultens, with his usual subtlety, finds the root in the Arab. *شَلَوَ liquavit*; and in a secondary sense, *ad liquidam tranquillitatem confusa et facata revocavit*.

Without any refinement or straining of the word, I too take שָׁלוֹם in its certain, acknowledged, acceptation*. Whether it be written שָׁלוֹם, שָׁלוֹה, or שָׁלוּ, I am not much concerned: although I am inclined to think that the last is the true reading; because it was that of almost all the Ant. versions: and because it is here in the masculine gender; as in Job, 20. 20. Yet all the Sam. copies with 38 Heb. mss. and one printed edition have שָׁלוֹה: which, as ה is radical, may also be a masculine. The word is in some other places written שָׁלוֹה; and once, Prov. 1. 32. שָׁלוֹת with a feminine verb. Making שָׁלוֹה then the nominative to יָבֵא, I render it *peaceful prosperity*†; and refer it to that period when, "the land being at rest," the Tabernacle was set up at *Shiloh*; which, doubtless, had its name from this very circumstance. Every part of the benediction is now clear, and conform to the rules of grammar. The harsh ellipsis is done away: the common signification of every term is preserved; and the whole is a beautiful prayer or prophecy, adapted to actual events and occurrences relative to the tribe of Judah. I say *prayer or prophecy*, because the words may be considered either as *precativæ* or *predictivæ*: and perhaps "May the sceptre, &c." would be a more proper version than "The sceptre shall not, &c." Jacob then wishes, or foretels, that Judah shall not be without a patriarchal sceptre-wielding chief, until the Israelites be put in possession of the promised land, and enjoy peace and prosperity. A similar wish is expressed by the good old man in ver. 18. "O Lord! from thee I wait for salvation!" which I am inclined to think stood originally in ver. 10. and made a part of the benediction of Judah. See Explan. Note.—Be this as it may, the whole tenor of the benediction leads to the meaning which I have given.

But what, then, becomes of the Messiah? Become of him what will, I confess I cannot here find a vestige of him: nor did the Messiah himself, nor any of his apostles or evangelists, apply this text to him; which is wonderful indeed, if they looked upon it as applicable: they who apply to him so many other Texts, which can, at most, refer to him in only a secondary and tralatitious sense. In A. B. Secker's MS. Notes I found an observation so judicious on this subject, that I cannot withhold it from my readers. "If the Messiah (says he) be here promised to "spring from Judah, how could God propose to destroy Israel, and make a nation of Moses?"

* involutus est fortis cum hominis tum pecudis; cujus forma fœminina extat, Deut. 28. 57. et metonymice pro ipso
 "factu recens nato, aut tenera prole, ponitur: ex quo שָׁלוּ, vel שָׁלוֹה, vel שָׁלוּ per apocopen, ad formam שָׁלוֹ, fit, cum
 "affixo, שָׁלוּ proles, fœdales ejus." This explanation, as modified by Dathe, belongs to the former class. * I believe it nearly the same with the Latin *salus*; which is probably derived from it. † The word is rendered *prosperity* more than once in our common version. See Ps. 30. 6.—122. 7.—Prov. 1. 32.—Jerem. 22. 21.

Exod. 32. 10. and Deut. 9. 14—14. 12. And, indeed, if this divine menace had taken place, the Messiah would not have sprung from Judah, but from Levi: although he would still have been the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: to whom the promise is every where else supposed to have been made.

Having thus disposed of *Sbiloh*, let us resume, and briefly explain the other words of the verse.

The word שֹׁטֵט, which I have rendered "*sceptred chief*," in its more simple signification signifies a *rod* or *staff*: which was the ensign of patriarchal power, as a *sceptre* was afterwards that of regal power. The Hebrew שֹׁטֵט seems to have been a long pointed staff, such as we would call a *pikestaff*: and indeed we find the word sometimes denoting a *spear**. From being the ensign of a tribal chief, it came to signify the chief himself, who wielded it, and even the tribe of which he was the chief. I take it here in the former of these secondary acceptations, on account of the parallelism.

The word which I have rendered "*a leader*," מְנַחֵם, is commonly translated a *law-giver*: but it denotes rather one who *directs* and *ordains* the keeping of laws already made, than an immediate legislator. The patriarchal chiefs had the *direction* and *leading* of their respective tribes; and perhaps might make local and occasional regulations: but they were not, properly speaking, *law-givers*.

In rendering the next word, רָגֵל, I have followed the common Hebrew reading: although it must be owned that the Sam. reading רָגֵל, followed by Houbigant, Durell, and some others, is very plausible. But all the antients seem to have read as the present Hebrew. Sep. ex rōg mōrōn autō. Vulg. *de femore ejus*: and so equivalently the rest.

The word עַד־כִּי, which I render *until*, does not mean that then Judah shall cease to have a *sceptred chief*: but merely that he shall not be without one, *until prosperity come*. Until that happy time, Judah was to take the lead among the tribes of Israel, and to be principally conducive to the conquest of Chanaan, and the peaceful prosperity of the Hebrew nation. Accordingly we find the standard and camp of Judah moving "forward the first," by the Lord's command, Num. 2. 9. And when after the death of Joshua the Lord was asked: "Who shall go the first, to make war against the Chanaanites?" the Lord answers: "Let Judah go: for lo! into his hands I deliver the land." Jud. 1. 1, 2. The same answer is given, when it was question of making war on the Benjaminites, Jud. 20. 18.—And all this perfectly well explains the last member of the present verse, "And to him the nations shall † be obedient:" especially if by the word *nations*, עַמִּים, be meant the other *tribes*: which meaning the context here seems to require.—There is a various reading in the Sam. copy, יִקְרָא instead of יִקְרָא: which Sam. reading is preferred by Houbigant and Teller. I suspect the original reading to have been יִקְרָא וְעַמִּים; but it is of very little importance, as the meaning is all the same. The word יִקְרָא signifies that *voluntary* and *submissive obedience*, which is paid to those in whom we confide: such as we may suppose was paid by the other tribes to that of Judah.

* We have two Saxon words which, in my conception, still retain the etymon: *spit* and *staff*. The former is the pure Hebrew word; and which in Islandic denotes a *spear*: and the latter is the same word from a transposition of letters; at first *stab*, and now *staff*. † This word has been, I know not how, omitted in the text of my Version.

‡ Nine Sam. mss. have יִקְרָא.

But although, every circumstance considered, I think it most probable, that the poet had in view the period which I have mentioned: yet it may be, that the end of David's reign is alluded to; when Judah was in high prosperity, and all the nations round subdued, and paying tribute to the king of Israel.

Ver. 11. *To the vine he shall tie his ass.* In those eastern countries the vines have large stems. Chardin saw some in Persia, which he could hardly grasp. After the vintage is over, the cattle feed on the leaves and tendrils.—This and the following verse give us a most graphic picture of the fertility of that tract which fell to the tribe of Judah, abounding in vineyards and fine pasturage.—There indeed, we find the vale of *Eshchol*, whence the spies, Num. 13. 23. brought a cluster of grapes that needed to be carried by two men on a pole—there the vineyards of *Engedi*, celebrated in the Song of Solomon: and as to pasturage, the mountainous parts, or the wilderness of Judah, were as famous, as its vales were for vines. It was there that the rich Nabal had his flocks. See 1 Sam. 25. 2.

Ver. 13. *Zebulon by a haven of the sea shall dwell.* Michaëlis in his Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr. has laboured to prove that *הָרֶם* signifies not a *haven*, but a *shore*: and so indeed all the Ant. translators seem to have understood it. Sep. *παραλιος*. Vulg. *in litore*. Onk. על ספר. Syr. and Tharg. על ספרי. Saad. פי שחול. Ar. Exp. שחול. Perf. בכנארי. Gr. Ven. *εις ακγιαλον*.—Notwithstanding all this mass of authority, I still think that *הָרֶם* here means a *haven*: or if it mean a *shore*, it means a shore with a haven at it. Every haven is a shore, although every shore be not a haven: and a number of havens on our own coasts are denominated shores: *Shore of Yarmouth, Shore of Scarborough, Shore of Leith, Shore of Banff, Shore of Buckie, &c.*—It is clear from what follows that the Shore of Zebulon was a shore of this kind; because we are told it was “a shore for ships,” *הָרֶם לְחֵמָה וְחֵמָה*. Hence in rendering this last comma, Sep. has *παρ' ὅρμον* (3 mss. ὅρμων) *πλοίων*: and the Greek of Venice, *εις λιμένα νεων*. So Vulg. *in statione navium*.—The Hebrew word itself is yet apparent in the Scoto-Saxon *hyf* or *hyve*, and in the English *havn* or *haven*: and still more so in the Scottish *houf*; which signifies a *place of resort, retreat and security*: and the German *hof* is most probably of the same origin.—The objection to the derivation of *הָרֶם* from *הָרַם* is, in my opinion, frivolous: for many other words are formed in the same manner: as *חַם, חָם, חֹם, חֹל, חֹם, חֹק* &c. unless it be said, that these are rather derived from *verbs quiescent* of the same purport, although not generally in use; to which I have no objection: only let me extend the same privilege to *הָרַם*. For who will affirm that the Hebrews, especially in poetry, may not have used *הָרַם* in the same meaning with *הָרַם*, although we have no other example of it?—I have only to add, that I consider *הָרַם* in the last comma to be the relative to the former *הָרַם*, and not to *וְהָרֶם*: so that the comma might be rendered: “and that *haven* shall be a haven (or harbour) for ships.”

Ver. 14. Very little help is derived from most of the antient versions for the explanation of this passage. The words *חֲמֹד נָרָם*, or as 15 mss. *חֲמֹד נָרָם*, are rendered by Sep. *το καλον επιθυμητον*. How they read in their copy, it is not easy to guess. Some critics imagine that their Text had *חֲמֹד* *desirable*, instead of *חֲמֹד* *an ass*; and that they took *נָרָם* in the sense of the Arab. *نارم* *concupiscit*. I am rather inclined to think, that they read *חֲמֹד נָרָם* *desired good things*, taking *נָרָם* for the plural of *נָרָם*, and this in the same sense as it is used by Leah, Gen. 30. 13. What gives the greater plausibility to this is the Sam. reading *נָרָם*, which they might readily

readily have mistaken for נדיר, or which might itself have been interchanged with נדיר by copyists posterior to the Septuagint. Yet what is still more remarkable, the Perfic translator, at a much later period, seems to have had before him a similar reading, or made the same mistake; as he renders במל גדולתו *great in wealth*: and, before him Onkelos ענין בכסין *ditatus opibus*. Could either of them have possibly drawn such a meaning from the present Hebrew, or even the present Sam. reading?

Be this as it may, the present Sam. reading was preferred by Durell, who renders the comma thus: "Issachar is the ass of strangers," or "travellers:" and thinks that this sense is confirmed by the Sam. version יסאכר, and by the next verse, where it is said that the Issacharites became tributaries. And in this he has been followed by Michaëlis, whose version is: "Issachar wird ein lastthier der fremden." In this, I believe, they have not been followed by any later interpreter.

For my part, I see no good reason for departing from the common reading; which is well rendered in the Latin Vulg. *afinus fortis*; by Arab. Erp. *وَحْشٌ قَوِيٌّ*; and more literally by Aquila *σὺς ὀσώδης* and by Gr. Ven. *σὺς ὀσῶν an ass of bone**, i. e. a strong ass. So Luther: "ein beinern efel."—Castal. *afinus offeus*.—Houbigant and Dathe, *afinus robustus*.—Delgado, and before him Lookup and Purver, a *boney ass*. Ainsworth, a *strong-boned ass*.

The three next words in the Text *בין שני כבלי* are in our public version rendered "couching down between two burdens;"—after Munster, Castalio, Junius, &c.—But this is a forced meaning, which cannot well be squeezed out of the original. I think the Septuagint have well rendered: *ἀντιπροσκειμένους ἀπὸ μέσσην τῶν ὁρίων*—and Jerom still better: *inter duos terminos*. Most of the antient versions have some similar term†; and the Greek of Venice only has *σπινθόμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡμιφορτίου*.—The tribe of Issachar inhabited the fine vale of Jezreel, which was separated by two natural boundaries or barriers‡ of mountains from the tribe of Zebulon and the half-tribe of Manassah, on the north and south; and on the east from the tribe of Gad, by the river Jordan||; and to this situation the benediction evidently alludes.—For the rest, I have elsewhere§ shewn that *רָבַץ* denotes not *couching under a burden* but *lying at ease*: as the Issacharites might do between their boundaries; where they cultivated a fertile soil, undisturbed by their neighbours; and led not a roving life like the inhabitants of the mountains, who were often obliged to remove from place to place to find pasturage for their flocks.

Ver. 15. *And becometh a tributary servant.* *וְיָצָא לְעַבְדּוֹ* without any variety of reading; save that 5 Sam. mss. have *לְעַבְדּוֹ*.—The words have been variously understood. Aquila, Jerom, Syr. Saad. Arab. Erp. the Perfic translator and Gr. Ven. render to the same purport with mine and

* The same metaphor we apply to a strong horse: "He is a horse of some bone—a well-boned horse, &c.

† So Luther: "zwischen die grentzen;"—and so our earlier English translators; Coverdale, Matthew, and Ainsworth. Pagninus had led the way.

‡ Some moderns, among whom Michaëlis, Dathe, and Rosenmüller, think that the word which I render *barriers* should be rendered *water-canal*. Durell's version is "between two bars," i. e. says he, a place where cattle are railed in and confined.—Green: "in his stall."—Delgado: "between two rows of sheep."—Purver: "between two packs." All, in my opinion, erroneous. See the Rem. on Judges, 5. 16.

§ *Ἰσαχαρίης, Καρμυλὸν τὰ ὄρη καὶ τὸν ποταμὸν τοῦ μέσου περικταμένη τέμματα* [αἱ τέμματα], τὸ δὲ Ἰταζυρίον ὄρος τοῦ πλατοῦς. Joseph. Antiq. l. v. c. 1. sect. 22.—Perhaps Symmachus had these boundaries in view, when he rendered *ἀναμεινόντων γυμνασίων*.

§ See the Remark on Gen. 1. 4, 7.

the common version.—But Onkelos and the Thargumists, unwilling to make Issachar a *tributary*, take the liberty to pervert the text into a quite contrary meaning; namely, *that he made tributaries of his enemies*. But indeed their whole paraphrase of the verse is so licentious, as to deserve no notice: although partly adopted by Jarhi and other Jewish commentators.—We have, therefore, only to advert to the Septuagint version, which differs from all the rest; and without any remarkable variety of lection runs thus: καὶ ἐγένθη αὐτῷ γαῶντος; and so nearly Symmachus: καὶ ἐγένθη γαῶντος ὑποφάγοντος. This explanation would perfectly suit the character of Issachar, and the context: but how extract it from the Hebrew? In Syriac I find נִסְבָּן used for a *goad*: is it probable that the Hebrews might call a tiller of the ground a *goad-servant**: as we say a *plough-man*? In the East, the man who holds the plough, directs also the cattle with a sort of goad. These cattle are commonly no more than a couple of oxen, cows or asses; and sometimes a single ox, cow or ass: so light is the plough, so shallow the furrow, and so easily pulverised the soil.—And this leads me to another etymon in favour of the Septuagint, from whom I never dissent but with reluctance.—One meaning of נִסְבָּן is *conterere, contundere, &c.* may not נִסְבָּן or נִסְבָּן, then, signify to *break* the clod, as we say; and as the Latins, *frangere glebas, offringere terram, &c.*

At any rate, the Issacharites seem to have been a settled agricultural tribe; who cultivating their own territory with *patient* labour (emblemized by the ass) were able to pay a part of the produce by way of tribute to the Chanaanite nations, whom they were not able to subdue: or, as I think more probable, to the other tribes who had not grain enough to support their families, employed chiefly in rearing flocks and herds. We rarely read of Issachar being engaged in any war: which is ever hostile to agriculture. Their *chiefs*, indeed, sometimes appear on the scene of action. They were Barak's trusty guard in his expedition against Sisera †: and among those who came to Hebron to make David king ‡, are mentioned *chiefs* of Issachar; but none of their dependents and retainers, who were probably left at home to cultivate the ground.

Ver. 17. *Dan shall be a serpent, &c.* This paints well the character of the Danites; who by stratagem more than by open bravery avenged themselves of their enemies, and extended their conquests. See the whole history of Samson; and the expedition to Leshem, Jud. 18.

Ver. 18. [*O Lord! &c.*] I have always thought that this verse either belonged to the benediction of Judah, or that it was interpolated. But as I am not willing readily to admit interpolations, I have given it a place in my Version, where it now stands in the text: leaving the reader to form his own judgment of it, and to make out of it—any thing he pleases. Whoever spoke it, or wrote it, it seems evidently to allude to the *peaceful* security of the Israelites, mentioned before v. 10. and to point to the same period.

Ver. 19. The tribe of Gad, from their situation, were much exposed to the incursions of the Arab hordes, who often invaded their territory; but were as often repulsed. There is no difficulty in the Text here:—although it has been variously misunderstood, and rendered: as the curious reader may see in his Polyglott: I have only to observe that the excellent rendering of

* Or *goad-man*; as in Scotland they still call the man who drives with a goad the plowing oxen.

† Jud. 5, 15.

‡ 1 Chron. 12, 32.

the Septuagint is there badly translated: *πειραταται* means not *tentare*, but *pradari*: and *πειραστηται* not *tentatio*, but *prædorum turba*.—Not badly Gr. Ven. *Γαδός, σπειρασμαὶ σπειταται αὐτοῦ αὐτὸς τε σπειταται πτερὰ*.

Ver. 20. As the vale of Jezreel, the portion of Issachar, seems to have abounded in corn, so the residence of Asher abounded in oil: hence in the benediction of Moses, Deut. 33. 24. it is said of Asher, "In oil he shall dip his feet." And it was probably from this rich and fertile tract of Judæa that the oil and other articles of commerce, mentioned by Ezekiel, 28. 17. were principally furnished to the Tyrians.

Ver. 21. This verse as it is now pointed in the Hebrew copies gives our common version: "Naphthali is a hind let loose; he giveth goodly words." So, most literally, Gr. Ven. *Ναφθαλὶς ελαφος πρῆβηται, ὁ δίδους ῥήματα καλλῶς*; and the Lat. Vulg. *Nephtali, cervus emissus, et datus eloquia pulchritudinis*. So also Saad. Perf. and Arab. Erp. and so with a slight metaphor Syr. and Pseudo-Jonathan.—Onkelos seems not to have known what to make of his Text: but it is plain that he found no *hind* in it. A part of his paraphrase coincides with the Septuagint version, which is, *Ναφθαλὶς ἐλεγχος ἀκίμενος, ἐκ δίδους ἐν τῷ γνησματοῖ* καλλῶς*; which, in general terms well expresses the real meaning; although badly rendered in the Latin translation:—it should be *candex diffusus*, or *luxurians*; not *virgultum refoletum*. But Bochart's version is still better: *Nephtali terebinthus pasula, edens ramos pulchros*; which, with Houbigant, Durell, Dathe and Michaëlis, I have followed in my Version. The metaphor is well adapted to the residence of Naphthali, which was a beautiful woodland country extending to Mount Lebanon; and producing fruits of every sort.

Ver. 22. We are now come to the benediction of Joseph, one of the finest passages in the whole Hebrew Scripture. Nothing could be better imagined, or more beautifully expressed. The old man is made to dwell on his beloved son with a complacency highly characteristic: he never can say enough; and totally exhausts the subject before he leaves it.—But, the language being poetical and figurative, it is not always easy to ascertain the true meaning of every particular part; although the tenour of the whole is readily enough perceived.

The very first words *בן פרת* present a difficulty, and have been variously rendered and understood.—Sép. *ὁὸς ὑψημῶς*.—Vulg. *Filius accrescens*.—Onk. *בן דסע*.—Syr. *ברא דתרבותא*, badly rendered *filius educationis*†.—Saad. *אבן פרת*.—Perf. *בן פרת*.—Arab. Erp. *בן פרת*.—Gr. Ven. *ἰσὺς αὐξησῶς*.—Thus the antients, with whom, as to the meaning of *פרת*, most of our earliest modern translators agree: but whether *בן* should be taken in a literal or metaphorical sense, in this they differ.—Pagninus, Piscator, Junius and our Ainsworth consider *בן פרת* as denoting a *fruitful branch*: and this interpretation was adopted by our latter translators: and more recently by Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe and Rosenmüller. The words of the last I will here insert: "*בן פרת* proprie *filius rami*, i. e. *surculus*. *פרת* enim scriptum esse videtur (ut "*Clericus, et post eum Dathius, monet*) pro *פארה ramus*, omissa *n* quiescente; ut sæpe." I cannot subscribe to this explanation; nor see I any reason to change the Text. *בן פרת* is literally the *son of fecundity*; but as the next member of the sentence is evidently metaphorical, this too must be metaphorically understood. The *son of fecundity*, then, is a *fruitful tree*: and

* Seven mss. add here *αὐτοῦ*. There is no other Var. read. of importance.

† It should be *filius incrementi*.

this tree is said to be planted by a *well*: just as the good man is said in Ps. 1. to be a *tree planted by water streamlets*. Whether the *palm-tree* or the *vine* be here alluded to, it is disputed. Teller will have it to be the *palm-tree*: but, from the context, I am persuaded, with Onkelos, that it is the *vine*. I have not, however, with Green, inserted the word *vine* in my Version: but the word *stem*, which I take to be preferable to *bough*, or *branch*. פֶּרֶת is not *filius rami*; but *filius fertilitatis*; or, as Teller in his German version renders, "ein sohn des garten," *filius horti*.—The *daughters* mentioned afterwards are the *branches* or *tendrils*.

There are yet two other explanations, which deserve attention, merely from the celebrity of the authors.—Our Durell, who seems to have thought that there was an impropriety in assimilating both Naphthali and Joseph to a tree or plant of any kind, thought he had removed that objection by taking פֶּרֶת to be the feminine of פֶּר, and rendering *the son of a heifer*: i. e. a *bullock*. "Joseph is a bullock; a bullock near a fountain." The *son of a ewe* would have been much more appropriate: for then we should have had an allusion to Joseph's mother רָחֵל, which bears exactly that signification.—And, perhaps, it was this idea that led Michaëlis to his version: "Der sohn einer fruchtbaren mutter ist Joseph"—*The son of a fruitful mother is Joseph*. But Rahel was far from being a fruitful mother: she was many years barren; and brought but two sons at last.

I will now take it for granted that the first part of the verse is well rendered *a fruitful stem is Joseph, a fruitful stem by a fountain**;—but here we are again arrested, and must force our way the best we can.—And, first, we must note the difference between the Hebrew and the Samaritan copies: the former has בְּנוֹת צֶמֶר, the latter בְּנֵי צֶמֶר. This last was evidently the reading of Sep. since they render υἱος μου νεωτατος†. How Onk. Syr. and the Thargumists read, it is hard to say: but Vulg. Pers. Arab. Erp. Gr. Ven. and, most probably, Saadius, read as the present Hebrew. To which is the preference due? Clearly, in my opinion, to the Hebrew. The other, although followed by Sep, is frigid, and destroys the beauty of the trope: for what connection is there between the preceding member and "my youngest [or younger] son upon the wall:" or as Sep.‡ "my younger son return to me." But, in the supposition that בְּנוֹת is the right reading, what does it here mean? Why, if פֶּר in the former comma be a *stem* or *greater bough*, בְּנוֹת must be the *left branches* or *tendrils*: and then, what more beautiful than the comparison? Joseph is a fruitful vine, the tendrils of which luxuriantly spread, and cover the whole wall against which it is planted||. This evidently alludes to the very numerous posterity of Joseph; or, as Moses in his Song expresses it, *the ten thousands of Ephraim*, and *the thousands of Manasse*.

Although I prefer, and follow, the Hebrew reading, I am persuaded that it has been early corrupted in one letter; and that the original reading was not בְּנוֹת but בְּנֵי. Many *vau's* and *he's* have been interchanged in the Hebrew text from their great resemblance in the antient characters.—I know no modern translator who has preferred the Sam. lection; except Houbi-

* I take no notice of those commentators who render פֶּר לִי ad or juxta oculum: that is, say they, *ita pulcher, ut admiraretur oculis*. The Septuagint ἐγλωσς, or the Vulgate decorus aspectu, may have given rise to this idea. Yet Jerom, in his *Hebrew Questions*, has *super fontem*. † Compl. and 9 mss. have νεωτατος. ‡ They read נָוִי revertere, for נָוִי, from the great similarity in the more antient Hebrew alphabet between the letters נָוִי and נָוִי. § Dathe: *cujus germina super murum ascendunt*.—Green: *whose branches fleet over the wall*. So also the Swedish translators.

gant and Durell; the former of whom renders: *filius meus junior mihi imperat*—a strange version, indeed, although great pains he has taken to defend it both in his Prolegomena and Notes*.—Durell: "My son, my young one was upon the wall; and the archers, &c." which how well he defends, the reader may see in p. 92. and 93. of his Dissertation. To me it appears to destroy the beauty of the passage.

But what shall we say of Michaëlis? who thus renders the Hebrew reading: "vor dem auge der tochter, die prächtig einhertritt, sich sehen zu lassen."—I will only say that it is a version unworthy of Michaëlis.

Ver. 23. 24. 25. There is hardly any thing worthy of remarking here, save that Sam. has ירברו instead of ירבו: and so Vulg. *Jurgati sunt*: which reading I think preferable; and have, with Houbigant and Michaëlis, followed it in my Version.—The remaining part of this benediction is delightful, and surpasses any thing of the kind. How ample and fine a description of Mount-Ephraim and Mount-Gilead, and the territories of the two tribes! every earthly blessing is here accumulated, that the heart of man can desire:—dews from the heavens—springs from the earth—fish from the seas and lakes—a numerous offspring, both of children and cattle—a fertile and salubrious soil—peaceful days and lasting prosperity—are all wished for Joseph, by his affectionate dying father†.

Ver. 27. I am not, now, quite pleased with my version of this verse: and yet I know not well how to mend it.—The word ער, commonly rendered *prey*, is by Sep. rendered ער;—*περὶ αὐτὸν ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ὑποψύχει*; and, if there were any example of ער signifying continuance of time without an objective case, I should have no difficulty in admitting this translation. "He ravens on from the day-break: and in the evening he divides the spoil." But I doubt if ער have ever such an indefinite meaning.—Green supposes that there has been a transposition in the words, and that the first comma should be the last||: and this, in part at least, seems to have been the reading of the Syr. translator: but as all the copies, both Heb. and Sam. as well as all the other Antient versions, read as we now read; I would not without some very cogent reason admit of any alteration in the Text: but would either give a somewhat different meaning to the word מכל, namely *to take*, which it sometimes has in the Chaldee: so that the version might be "In the morning he catcheth his prey, and toward even he divideth the spoil:"—or, with Teller, say that the word חלק signifies here, not *to divide*, but *to tear*: so that the meaning will be only a repetition of the wolf's ravening: "mane comedet prædam, et vespere discerpet spoliū" i. e. *semper hostes suos infestabit*.—The tribe of Benjamin were certainly a warlike race. They twice routed the collected force of the other tribes with a far inferior number§. On this occasion we are told that, besides wielding the sword and javelin with their right hands, many of them could use their left hands with great dexterity. "They could sling stones at an hair and not miss¶." The Judge Ebed, one of those left handed worthies, dispatched Eglon; and putting himself at the head of a sudden collection

* "Videt Jacob in Joseph filio suo alterum Joseph, nempe MESSIAM, in quem etiam prophetie hujus cætera verba collimant." Credat!

† See a fine description of the Samaritans in Josephus de Bello Jud. l. iii. c. iii. sect. 4.

‡ So Vat. but Compl. Ald. Alex. and 31 MSS. have *diadurum*.

§ His version is "In the evening he shall eat the prey, and for the morning he shall leave part of the spoil:" but this is forcing upon חלק a sense which, in my apprehension, it cannot bear

¶ See Jud. 20. 15—25.

¶ Jud. 20. 16.

of troops, gained so complete a victory over the Moabites, that "the land had rest eighty years*."

Saul, too, although a reprobated king, was certainly a man of valour; and the warlike feats of both him and his son Jonathan are celebrated even by his competitor and successor David, in most beautiful strains†. The same royal poet pays a similar compliment to Abner, who had for several years supported the house of Saul against himself‡; and who, if he had not been disgusted at the conduct of Ishboeth, might have long continued the contest, with at least doubtful success. And when he came over to the side of David, Joab was so sensible of his superior merit, that he way-laid and assassinated him.—Yet not even after this were the Benjaminites subdued, or relinquished their attachment to the house of Saul. When the other tribes came in great numbers to make David king at Hebron; no more than three thousand of the tribe of Benjamin appeared: "for as yet (says the historian) the greater part of them favoured the house of Saul||:" and the posterior rebellion against David was headed by Shebah Ben-Bichri, "a Benjaminite§."—In short, it is clear that the tribe of Benjamin were a very warlike tribe; and as war, in those days, was ever followed by depredation, they might justly be likened to a ravenous wolf. Perhaps the great prey taken by Saul, after the destruction of the Amalekites, may be particularly alluded to.

Ver. 33. *He drew up his feet, &c.* We may suppose that Jacob, while he delivered his last words, was sitting upon his bed, with his legs without it, and his feet on the floor: his drawing up his feet, when he had done, was natural; and as he was now exhausted with speaking, he expired immediately after.

C H A P. L.

Ver. 19. *FOR a reverer of God am I.*—The reading of the present Hebrew Text is: **וְיִרְאָה אֱלֹהִים אֲנִי**; which in our common version is rendered: "For *am* I in the place of God?" from Pagninus's *Nunquid enim loco Dei sum?* But none of the more antient translators seem to have understood the words in that meaning, save Aquila, Symmachus, and Gr. Ven.** The rendering of Sep. is without any important variation: *του γαρ Θεου εμμε εγω*. Vulg. *Num Dei possumus reflesere voluntati?* Syr. **כִּסְלִי דְחִוְתָּא אֱלֹהִים אֲנִי**.—Onk. **אֲנִי דְדִלְאָה דִּי אֲנִי**.—Tharg. **אֲנִי דְדִלְאָה דִּי אֲנִי**.—Saad. **אֲנִי דְחִוְתָּא אֱלֹהִים**.—Arab. Erp. **أَنَا دَوْلَاةُ مَنْ أَلَّهَ**.—Perf. **تَرَسَدْتَهُمْ دَوْلَاةُ مَنْ**. *Timens Dei ego*. All these translators, except the first three, express the idea of *fear, reverence, awe*: hence some modern critics have thought that they had before them the Sam. reading **וְיִרְאָה**: and, indeed, this reading seems preferable to the present reading, both from the context, and from a similar saying of Joseph's, in another place, but on a similar occasion: namely, Ch. 42. 18. **אֲנִי וְאֶלְעָזָר אֲנִי יְיָ**.—His brothers, among other motives for his forgiving them, had urged their being "the servants of *his* father's God," v. 17.—*Fear not, says Joseph—for I particularly revere that God.* All this, I think,

* Jud. 4. 30. † 2 Sam. 1. 21, 22. ‡ 2 Sam. 3. 34. § 1 Chron. 12. 29. § 2 Sam. 20. 2.

** The first has, *ἐν τῷ ᾧ ἔσται Θεοῦ εἶναι*; the second, *μη γαρ αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι εἶναι*; and the latter, *ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι*.

is included in the word דָּרַר, where the ה is not an *interrogative*; but a very significant *relative*, indicating a more than common reverence for the Divinity: as we sometimes say in English "I am *the* man who dare do such and such a thing."—Thus Jerem. Lam. 3. 1. עֵי דָּרַר רָאָה עֵי.—The more still to express his reverence, he uses a stronger word than in ch. 42. דָּרַר instead of יָרָא.—As this reading*, then, makes an excellent sense, is congenial to Joseph's piety, and agreeable to the context, I have with Houbigant, Dathe, Rosenmüller, &c. given it the preference in my Version: but I must, at the same time, allow that the other reading is not without its plausibility. But, then, דָּרַר must not be rendered *instead of*, but *under or subordinate to*. So Luther: "Denn ich bin unter Gott," and so our first translators, Coverdale and Matthew: "for I am under God"—"am not I under God?" And, perhaps, the Septuagint τοῦ γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐμὲ ἔγω may be reducible to the same meaning: as ἐγὼ μὲν ἐμὲ Παύλου in 1 Corinth. 1. 13.—Nay, I would not positively affirm that the other ancient translators, who have rendered as if דָּרַר, not דָּרַר, had been in their copies, might not have read the latter: although they gave the phrase another turn. The Thargumist, in particular, seems to have had something like דָּרַר in his view, as he adds נִתְּרָה, which give the idea of *subjection* and *humiliation*; more than once expressed by דָּרַר in the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly in the Psalms.—Either of the readings, then, will admit my Version: although, on the whole, I am inclined to give the preference to the Samaritan.

Ver. 23. *In the days of Joseph.* So Sam. בְּיָמֵי יוֹסֵף; which, with the Author of *Commentaries and Essays*, I prefer to the present Hebrew reading עַל בְּרִכְי יוֹסֵף; which James's translators render *upon Joseph's knees*: giving to יָרַד the forced meaning *were brought up*.—Dathe gives the sentence a different turn.—*Etiam filios Macheri... gremio suo excepit*: a still greater, and more unaccountable licence. Yet all the ancient translators had the present Hebrew before them, from Sep. down to Gr. Ven. See the Rem. on 2 Sam. 21. 8.

EXODUS. CHAP. I.

Ver. 10. **L**ET us wisely prevent their multiplying. Sep. admirably: κατασφραγισμεθα αυτους.—The Egyptians were famous for their cunning and worldly wisdom. Δεδοι πλεονατοι μηχανας Αιγυπτιοι†.

Ib. *And get out of the land.* וְעָלָה מִן הָאָרֶץ. The Syr. translator read in the coactive voice: *and drive us out of the land*: and, what is more remarkable, the Coptic version, although made from the Greek, has the same reading, with *our* instead of *the* before *land*. This *our*, ἡμῶν, is also

* To this reading it is objected, that it is not even the common Samaritan reading, it being found in only one ms.—True: but this is confessedly the best ms. that has yet been seen: which was purchased by *Pietro della Valle*, from the Samaritans of Damascus; and from which Morinus published the first printed copy of the Sam. Exemplar. Besides, we learn from the Fragments of Origen's Hexapla, that it was the reading of his day—το Σαμαρειτικόν: καὶ γὰρ φερούμενος Θεοῦ ἐγὼ εἶμι. † Fragm. Eschyl. apud Scholiast. in Nub. Aristoph.

in the Glasg. and perhaps some other mss. *—In this verse the Rev. Mr. Dimock would read תָּקַדְתָּ וְהָלַחְתָּ; and so seems to have read Gr. Ven. *παρὰ τὴν στήλην ἔστης*.—But all the Antients read as the present Text; I mean as it is in the Samaritan copy, תָּקַדְתָּ, not תָּקַדְתָּ; although our sticklers for the integrity of the Hebrew text excuse this blunder, by calling it a *Chalkaism*.

Ver. 16. *Ye shall inspect the troughs.* וְרִאיתֶם עַל הָאֲבָנִים; rendered in our common version, “and see them upon the stools;” from Pagninus’s *videritis super sellas*. So Luther: “und auf dem stuhl sehet:” and so most modern interpreters, who have literally rendered.—The great point is, to ascertain the meaning of אֲבָנִים. In Heb. Chald. Syr. Sam. and Æth. the common signification of אֶבֶן is a *stone*; in which sense it frequently occurs, both in its singular and plural forms. But in two places, here and Jerem. 18. 3. it has been supposed to have a different meaning, and has been variously translated. In Jerem. it is by our translators rendered *wheels*; and, in the margin, *frames, or seats*.—In both places the Ant. versions vary, but more particularly in the former. Sep. renders the whole comma thus: *עוֹשֵׂה מַעֲשֵׂה כְּפִי הָאֵל וְהָאֵל*. Vulg. *et partus tempus advenerit*: both, seemingly, a paraphrase.—Onk. and Tharg. על מַעֲשֵׂה דְּחַיִּים *ad eruptionem*: not, *super sellas*, as Tharg. is badly rendered in the Polyglott.—Syr. רִאיתֶם חַיִּים *Be attentive when they* (the women in labour) *are on their knees*: i. e. in the act of bearing.—Both Arabs: أَلْمَعْبَر, rendered, in Pol. *exbedra*; by Michaëlis *suggestum*. I cannot, however, think that either is the meaning; and suspect that the true Arabic reading is أَلْمَعْبَر *profluvium*; and nearly equivalent to the מַעֲשֵׂה of Onkelos.—Perf. renders literally סִבְכֵּי סִבְכֵּי *stones*.—Gr. Ven. *ἐπὶ τοῖς καθέδραις*.—So much for the Ant. versions.

I have already observed that most modern translators are for *stools*, or a *stool* supposed to be composed of two pieces. Even Dathe adopts this version: *attenderent in sella, non puer sit*.—But some Jewish rabbis, with Oleaster, Vatable and Grotius, imagine that אֲבָנִים signifies *the hinges of the womb* (as they are pleased to term them) which give way to the foetus, at the time of birth. I shall give their comment in the words of Oleaster: “*Obnaim* (אֲבָנִים) hic puto “significare duos cardines ventris, qui sunt ad modum ostii in ædificio; et vocantur obnaim “à *ben*, quod est filius; quod per illa ostia, seu cardines, filii egrediantur. Et si objicias: quomodo possent obstetrices intra cardines videre, an esset masculus, an fœmina? hoc facile “cognosci potest; quoniam *facies* in masculo *inferne*, in fœmina verò *superne*!” What a wonderful knowledge in anatomy and midwifery the good father here discovers! but he took it from Rabbi Joseph, and D. Kimhi: whom the reader may see, if he chooses, on the word אֶבֶן; or in Fagius’s Commentary, in the first volume of the *Sacred Critics*.

Michaëlis, with great ingenuity, defends the Septuagint and Vulgate; deriving אֲבָנִים from the Arab. مَوَان, مَوَان or مَوَان, all which signify *time, occasion, &c.* and renders, in his German version, “bey eintretender geburt darauf acht zu geben:” and this is deemed the better rendering by Schulze and Rosenmüller. Castalio seems to have had the same idea, as he renders in *ipso enixu*: unless he had in view the מַעֲשֵׂה of Onkelos.—Even the text of Jeremiah Michaëlis thinks susceptible of the same meaning—*ipsum tempus quo vas perficitur et finitur*. In

* I am sorry that Dr. Holmes’s Collation has been published only as far as the end of Genesis: so that I cannot avail myself of it any further, except in a very few instances; and that with respect to three mss. only. † The א and ב in Arabic are distinguished only by diacritic points; and are often, in mss. confounded with one another.

this, I believe, few critics will agree with him : and, I confess, I cannot agree with him, with respect to the meaning of the word, here. For, in the first place, it is not probable that the Hebrew writer would make use of an uncommon Arabic word to express the *tempus parienti* : when his own language afforded him a much better, namely עַת לִדְוֹת, which is the very term used by Job. 39. 1. and 2 ; and by Solomon, Eccl. 3. 2. עַת לִדְוֹת.—Secondly, if the writer had used מִבֵּן in the meaning of the Arab. مَبْنٍ, he would not probably have used it in the plural number.—Thirdly, the verb רָאוּ constructed with עַל, which, by the *by*, it rarely is*, denotes *superinspection*, or *attention to some person or thing*, but never, I believe, *to time or place*. All these considerations make me reject Michaëlis's version. As to the Septuagint and Jerom ; they seem, to me, to have guessed at the meaning from the context : without knowing what to make of מִבְּנִים.

But what, then, are we to make of it ? Why ; as מִבְּנִים certainly signifies *stones* ; and as in the same book of Exodus, 7. 19. it denotes *stone cisterns* ; why may it not here denote *stone troughs* ; in which, according to the Eastern custom, new-born infants are washed ? This sense accords perfectly well with the passage of Jeremiah ; which Blayney and Bradley, after Sep. render *upon the stones* ; but which I would render, as here, *troughs* ; in which the potter wrought his materials into a proper consistency.—Whether those troughs were composed of several stones, as the plural form מִבְּנִים should seem to infer, cemented together, as many of our cisterns are ; or were hollowed single stones, it is impossible to determine ; although I am inclined to think that the first stone troughs were made of several pieces : and might be *bathing-places*, as well as *cisterns* ; for the purpose of ablution.—This is the best interpretation I can make of the passage : in which I was preceded by Bate. But I would not, with him and Parkhurst, translate “ when ye see them on the stone troughs ; ” because there is no *them* in the original ; and because I am persuaded that the *inspection* regarded the *infant*, not the *mother*.

Ver. 19. *They are more vigorous.* כִּי רוּחַ וְזֶדֶה ; which the ancients render variously Sep. טַהוּרָא.—Sym. καὶ πνεῦμα καὶ ζῆλος ; from whom Jerom. *obstetricandi habent scientiam*.—Theod. ἐν ζωτικῇ.—Onk. אִרִּי וְזִכְיוֹן מִבֵּן *For wise† are they* ; and to the same purpose paraphrases the Bab. Tharg. but Jerus. has רוּחַ *vivacious*. Syr. רוּחָא, the same word by which *mid-wives* are denoted in the preceding comma.—Saad. בְּצִירָא *intelligent*.—Arab. Exp. مَوْرِفَات of the same import.—Pers. دُرُخְدَادَن *ingenious*.—Gr. Ven. Σοφῆς.—This last meaning has been adopted by some moderns : who make the mid-wives tell Pharaoh, that the Hebrew women are like *brute beasts*, who have no need of obstetric aid. Michaëlis is for *mid-wives*, and thinks that all those versions which render by words that denote *intelligence, wisdom, skill*, are metaphorical expressions ; like the French *sages femmes*, &c. But it is well observed by Dathe, if the author had meant to say that the Hebrew women were *mid-wives*, he would not probably have changed the terms ; and substituted רוּחַ for חָכְמָה.—Besides, if the Hebrew women were themselves mid-wives ; what need was there for other mid-wives at all ?—On the whole, then, I am persuaded that רוּחַ is here to be taken in its literal meaning ; and denotes the *lively vigour* of the Hebrew women to bear children with little or no assistance. “ Je ne sçais pas (says De la Roque) si les femmes Arabes sentent moins de mal que les autres ; ou si elles le supportent

* Not, I believe, above five or six times ; and only twice in the Pentateuch.

† Or, *skillful*.

“plus courageusement : mais elles accouchent en chemin, et partout où elles se trouvent.
 “Quelques momens après qu’elles sont délivrées, elles prennent l’enfant, lui lient le nombril,
 “et le vont laver à la première fontaine.—“The women at Aleppo (says Rufiel, vol. 1. p. 299.)
 “have easier labours, than in the northern regions : owing, perhaps, to the frequent use of
 “the bath, as well as to the mild climate : for, in the latter months of pregnancy, they go
 “very often to the bagnio.”

Ver. 21. *He prospered their own families.* וַיִּשְׁפָּרוּ לָהֶם בָּתִּים, lit. *he made to them houses.* The word בָּתִּים being in the masculine gender, our grammarians will have it to be an *enallage*. As I am always unwilling to admit such *enallages*, I hoped to find בָּתִּים in the Sam. exemplar, and perhaps in some Hebr. mss. But no! all uniformly read לָהֶם. What then are we to do? admit the *enallage*? or refer לָהֶם not to the mid-wives, but to the Israelites? The latter has pleased Michaëlis and Dathe: but pleases not me. The context, I think, evidently tells us to apply it to the mid-wives: *because they feared God, God rewarded them*, is a clear consistent sentence: whereas, *because they feared God, God rewarded the Israelites*; is unnatural and un-consecutive.—All the Greek translators, even Gr. Ven. understood it to be the mid-wives; whether they read בָּתִּים or בָּתִּים. Sep. ἐποτρυνε* ἑαυταῖς οἰκίας.—Aquila ἐποτρυνε ἑαυταῖς οἰκίας.—Sym. ἐποτρυνε† ἑαυταῖς οἰκίας.—Theod. ἐποτρυνε αὐταῖς‡ οἰκίας.—Gr. Ven. ἐποτρυνε οὐν ἐκείνων δομοῦς—an error, for δομοῦς.—Of the other ant. versions, some are ambiguous as the Vulg. and Perf.—The Thargumists and both Arabs have the masculine בָּתִּים, מִבָּתִּים, לָהֶם: but Syr. has בָּתִּים.—Whether, then, we admit the *enallage*, or suppose that the original reading was בָּתִּים; we must, I think, refer it to the mid-wives. The meaning is well explained by a Greek scholiast in Caten. Nicet. τοῦτων ἐστὶ τὸ, ἐποτρυνε αὐταῖς οἰκίας, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν πύξην αὐταῖς τὸ γένος.

Ver. 22. *Then Pharaoh charged all his people, &c.* The cause of this cruel order, according to Josephus, was the prediction of an Egyptian Seer, that a Hebrew child was about to be born, who would one day diminish the power of Egypt, and increase that of the Israelites: τῶν ἐργαζομένων τις . . . ἀγγέλλει τῷ βασιλεῖ, “τεχνησοῦμαι τινα, κατ' ἐκείνων τὸν καιρὸν, τοῖς Ἰσραηλῆταις, ὅς ταπεινώσει μὲν τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἡγεμονίαν, αὐξήσει δὲ τοὺς Ἰσραηλῆταις τράπεζας ἀρετῇ δὲ πανταὶ ὑπερβαλεῖ, “καὶ δοξὰν αἰμῆς αὐτῶν κτήσεται.” Antiq. lib. ii. c. 9. n. 2.—The same historian tells us, ib. n. 3. that God revealed all this more explicitly to Amram in a dream: which, on awaking, he told to his wife Jochabel, or Jochabed. Hence their great care and anxiety about the safety of their child.—But of all this not a single word in the book of Exodus.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 3. *AN ark of papyrus.* אֲרוֹן נִיפְתָּר. Forster makes the latter word a compound of *Sau* a ship and *βου* a palm-branch. But why introduce here an Egyptian compound? Had it been a proper name such as *Moses* or *Zaphnath-paaneah*, there might be some reason for seeking Egyptian etymologies: but this is an appellative noun; and the same word that is used to express the ark of Noah.—I imagine the radical meaning may be found in the Arab. *أَرَك* *construere*.—

* This is the reading of Compl. which I trust will be confirmed by some of Holmes's mss. The other editions have ἐποτρυνε.
 † Such is the genuine reading; not ἐποτρυνε, as in Montfaucon. See Scharfenberg, p. 53.

‡ Better than αὐταῖς.

Against Forster's derivation is the meaning of מִנִּי, which is evidently a Hebrew word, that expresses well the *bibulous* nature of the *papyrus*, but not of the *palm-tree*—

*Conferitur bibulâ Memphitis cymba papyro**.

It is remarkable that Lucan here uses a word nearly equivalent to the Arabic *قندل* *construere*.—The *papyrus* is a very thrifty plant, that grows in marshy ground on the banks of rivers. A considerable part of it is under water; and it grows to the height of nine or ten feet.—The pith or marrow of the stalk was used for food, the ligneous parts were constructed into arks and small ships, and the bark was made into *paper*†.

Ib. *Among the fedges*, בִּסְרָה. Sep. *us* τοῖς ἔλος.—Vulg. *in carello*. Onk. בִּישְׂרָה.—Syr. בִּישְׂרָה.—Tharg. Bab. בְּנוֹרִיָּה.—Jerus. בְּנוֹרִיָּה.—Saad. בְּנוֹרִיָּה.—Arab. Erp. بِنُورِي.—Pers. بِنُورِي.—Gr. Ven. ἐν τῇ φάτῃ. All which are generic names; except the בְּנוֹרִיָּה of the Bab. Thargum; which is equivalent to the Hebrew word.—There is little doubt of its being the sedge called *fari*; which, as we learn from Theophrastus and Pliny, grows on the marshy banks of the Nile, and rises to the height of almost two cubits: “Fruticosi generis est *sari*, circum Nilum nascens, “duorum fere cubitorum altitudine.” Plin. lib. xiii. 23.

Ver. 5. *Her band-maid*, אִמָּה אֲמָהָה. The Ant. versions differ in rendering this. Sep. אִמָּה.—Vulg. *aman e famulabus*.—Syr. אִמָּה.—Onk. אִמָּה.—Tharg. אִמָּה.—Saad. אִמָּה.—Erp. אִמָּה.—The first four‡ are for *band-maid*; to which must be added Gr. Ven. τῇ ἐσθλῇ οὐκ ἐστὶν: the rest are for *band* or *arm*: and some Jewish Rabbis, according to the testimony of Rashi, so explained it. But Rashi himself, as well as Aben-Ezrah, reject that explanation; which has been followed by no Christian interpreter, as far as I recollect.

Ver. 10. I have made a strange mistake in my Explanatory Note on this verse: in saying that Moses was 40 years old, when his mother brought him to Pharaoh's daughter. It must, I think, have been immediately after the suckling time: which, Josephus says, was three years: τρεῖς μὲν αὐτῷ γέγονε χρόνος: and this, indeed, seems to have been the common period of suckling. Comp. 2 Machab. 7. 27.

Ib. *And called his name Moses*, וַיִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ מֹשֶׁה. That the daughter of Pharaoh would give her adopted son an Egyptian name, is hardly to be doubted: but that מֹשֶׁה is an Egyptian word, I cannot easily believe. Philo indeed, who was an Alexandrian Hellenist-Jew, says it is derived from *μῦς* which is the Egyptian name for water. Josephus chants the same song to a somewhat different tune: το γὰρ ὕδωρ ΜΩ οἱ Αἰγυπτίοι καλεῖσθαι, ΤΣΗΣ δὲ τὸς ἐξ ὕδατος σωθεῖσθαι. Clemens Alex. contents himself with μῦς. Gregory of Nyssa says the whole word Μωϋσῆς signifies *water*: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ τὸ ὕδωρ λέγεται τῇ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων φωνῇ.—Suidas, with Clem. Alex. only says that Μωϋσῆς is derived from μῦς. Μοῦ τὸ ὕδωρ παρ' Αἰγυπτίαις ἐξ οὗ καὶ Μωϋσῆς.—The Septuagint translators seem to have been of the same opinion: as they write the name Μωϋσῆς *Moyfes*.—Notwithstanding all this, I have no hesitation in affirming, with Vereftoi||, that the word מֹשֶׁה is Hebrew, not Egyptian: and that the paronomasy is borrowed not from *water*, but

* Lucan, iv. 136.

† See Suidas in verbo Πάπυρος.—Plin. lib. xiii. 11. Theophrast. lib. iv. 9. and Celsus

Hierobot, P. ii. p. 137, &c.

‡ The אִמָּה מִן of Onkelos is, in the Latin translation, unwarrantably rendered

brachium.

|| In *Sylloge Dissertationum*, &c. vol. i. p. 8. et seq.

from *extraction* out of the water. "She called his name *Moses* (*extraction*) because (said she) "I *extracted* him out of the water!"—It is not, however, improbable, that the Hebrew historian gave the equivalent of some Egyptian word, for the purpose of playing on it: as is very common in Hebrew proper names. Aben-Ezrah says that the Egyptian name of *Moses* was *Monios*, or *Munios*; as he found in an Egyptian book on agriculture, translated into Arabic, entitled עֲבוֹדַת הָאֲדָמָה *The culture of the land*.—But enough of the name of *Moses*: let us proceed to his history*.

Ver. 11. *In those days*. בְּיָמֵים הָהֵם. It is hardly necessary to tell the Scripturist, that these words denote any period of time, never very remote, but not always very near, to prior occurrences. The protomartyr Stephen (Acts, 7. 23.) says this happened in the 40th year of *Moses's* age—on which I find the following just remark of Archbishop Secker: "Whence did he learn that? He (*Moses*) must have been more than *forty* when he left Egypt, or must have staid *"forty years with Jethro"*—which is not at all probable. There might have been, however, a tradition among the Jews in Stephen's time, that *Moses* had left Egypt in his fortieth year; although this be no where recorded in Scripture. But that tradition is of no great weight in settling Scripture chronology.—During this first period of the life of *Moses*, whatever was its duration, *Josephus*† makes him carry on a successful war against the *Æthiopians*, after the Egyptians had been shamefully routed by them. For, after that defeat, having consulted the Divinity, they were told that they must call into their aid a *Hebrew*!—Then who so proper as *Moses*, the adopted son of *Thermuthis*? for that was the name of Pharaoh's daughter.—Well; *Moses* is charged with an expedition against the *Æthiopians*—and uses the following stratagem to surprise them: Instead of marching along the banks of the Nile, he traverses a desert; and as this desert is infested with a prodigious number of serpents of the most dangerous kind, he takes along with him coops of *ibises*, the mortal enemies of the serpentine race; and, in proper time and place, lets them loose upon the serpents; whom they suddenly devour, and clear the way for the Egyptian army.—The *Æthiopians* are surprised, beaten, and shut up in their capital *Saba* (afterwards *Meroë*), a strong insulated place, and extremely difficult to reduce.—But while *Moses* is performing prodigies of valour, during the siege, *Tbarbis*, the *Æthiopian* king's daughter, falls desperately in love with him, and offers to deliver up the town, on condition that he marry her.—No sooner said, than done: φθάνει το έργον τους λόγους—and, after the destruction of the *Ethiopians*, κατὰ τὴν ἀναγγελίαν τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν, and thanks given to God, εὐχαριστήσας τῷ Θεῷ, *Moses* consummates the marriage, συντελεῖ τὸν γάμον; and marches back the victorious Egyptians into their own country.—And this is the same *Josephus*, who seriously tells us, that he writes nothing, in his Jewish Antiquities, which he draws not from the *sacred* books of his nation! Either, then, the *sacred* books of his nation were different from the *sacred*

* We have here another curious anecdote in *Josephus*.—When *Thermuthis* presented her adopted son to her father, as his apparent successor to the throne of Egypt, the King took him in his arms, and put his own diadem upon the boy's head. But the petulant boy threw it on the ground, and trampled upon it. On which, the same seer who had foretold the birth of *Moses*, exclaimed, "This is that very child, O King! whom if we kill, God has declared us safe and secure... By destroying him, then, free the Egyptians from their apprehensions, and cut off all hopes from the "Israelites."—The interposition of *Thermuthis*, however, prevailed, and *Moses* was saved. Ant. lib. ii. c. 9. n. 7. † Antiq. lib. vii. c. 10.

books of our present Hebrew Bible; or Josephus made no scruple of interlarding them with apocryphal stories. Of what value, then, is his testimony, "That the Jews had so great a veneration for their *sacred* Scriptures, that, after the lapse of many ages, no one had dared "to add any thing to them, subtract any thing from them, or make any alteration in them?" *Δηλον δ' ἐστὶν ἔργον, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἱσθὺς γραμμάτων περὶ τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων, ὅτι οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν οὐδὲ προσέθευεν τίς αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ ἀφείλεν αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ μεταβίβασεν τινος αὐτῶν.* Contra Apion. lib. i. sect. 8. vol. 2. p. 441, 442. ed. Havercamp.

I have contrasted this testimony with the foregoing abstract, not to depreciate the merit of Josephus as an historian: for I admire him in that capacity; and deem his story of the *Æthiopic* war at least as credible as many parts of the Mosaic history in the Pentateuch—but to shew, how inconsistent he is with himself, when the honour and veracity of his nation are called in question.—For if Apion had retorted, and said: "Ye Jews pretend to be so exceedingly scrupulous about adding, paring, or altering any thing in what ye call your *sacred* writings, that no one (you say) ever dared to do such a nefarious deed; let me ask you, in "which of those *sacred* records have you found the story of the *Æthiopic* war?" I believe Josephus, with all his ingenuity, would have been puzzled to give a tolerable answer.

Ver. 12. *Hide him in the sand.* That, in case his body should be discovered, it might be believed that he had been accidentally overwhelmed; as it frequently happens in sandy regions. See Le Clerc on the place.

Ver. 13. *Quarrelling.* *קָנַן* It denotes *pulling one another by the hair*: as women are wont to do. Sep. *διαπληκτιζόμενος*.—Vulg. *rixantes*.—Aquila and Sym. *διαμαρτυρούμενος*.—Gr. Ven. *αντοχλουμενος*, in the dual number.

Ver. 16. *A priest of Midian.* Or, *a prince of Midian*; for the word *כֹּהֵן* signifies both: and perhaps both were united in the person of Raguel; like Virgil's Anius, who was at the same time king of Delos and priest of Apollo:

"Rex Anius; rex idem hominum, Phœbique sacerdos."

So the Rabbis say, that *כֹּהֵן* denotes either *אֵלֹהִים* or *אֵלֹהִים* *the head of the people or the minister of God*: and indeed I take the former to have been the original meaning of the word. Every one knows that *Chan* *כֹּהֵן* is the title of the sovereign of Tartary: and even in Hebrew the word *כֹּהֵן* must sometimes be understood of *political*, not *sacerdotal*, preëminence. The sons of David, 2 Sam. 8. 18. are called *כֹּהֵן*, although they were not priests.

Ib. *Their father Jethro.* In my Explan. Note, I have said that Jethro was the same with Hobab, who accompanied Moses through the wilderness, and whose posterity, under the name of Kenites, settled in the wilderness of Judah. Jud. 1. 16. By comparing all the passages that relate to those relations of Moses, I am now of opinion that Hobab was a younger brother of Jethro: as it is not probable that Jethro, the elder son, would abandon his father and the priesthood, or principality, in Midian; to which his birthright entitled him.

Ver. 22. *Again she bare, &c.* This addition is not in the present copies of either Sam. or Hebr. but I have no doubt of its having been once a part of the Text. It is in the Latin Vulgate, and in the Syriac and Arabic versions in the Polyglott: and in most copies of Sep. namely, in the Complutenian and Aldine editions; in the Coptic version, in the Glasgow Osta-

teuch,

teuch, in the uncial Ambrosian ms. and in that of Abbate Canonico: and I doubt not but it will be found in several other mss. when Dr. Holmes's Collation shall appear,

Ver. 23. *After many days.* Stephen (Acts, 7. 30.) says it was after forty years. But see the Rem. on ver. 11. and on Ch. 7. 7.

Ver. 25. *Manifested himself to them.* The present Text has אלהים ידע, and *God knew*. In which, say our critics, there seems to be a sort of emphasis, by which it is hinted that God would no longer delay his aid: "In hac repetitione aliqua *emphasis* inesse videtur, qua innuitur, "Deum noluisse diutius differre auxilium*." I should like to see such another *emphatical repetition* in the Hebrew Scriptures. The instance brought by Le Clerc from ch. 1. 7. is nothing to the purpose, as Houbigant has well shewn.—Read with Sep. אלהים ידע, και εγνωσθη† αυτοις. The Complut. edition of Vulg. and most other editions prior to that period, have *liberavit eos*; and so it was printed in the edition of Sixtus V. But the Clementine correctors changed it into *cognovit eos*; which was the reading of 10 of Hentenius's mss. and of the antient edition of Nuremberg of 1475. Both readings confirm the Hebrew reading אלהים: and *cognovit* must here be taken in the sense of *attending to, regarding, &c.* Saadiah and even Onkelos seem to have understood the Hebrew words in the same manner: but the Greek is by far the best translation. A construction exactly similar occurs in Ezech. 20. 9. אנכי אלהים נודתי I manifested myself to them.

C H A P. III.

Ver. 2. *AN angel of the Lord.* מלאך יהוה. All the Ant. versions have either *an angel of the Lord*, or *an angel of God*; save Vulg. which has *Dominus* in all the copies that I have seen, whether edited or in ms.; and so the same angel is called ver. 4. This distinction of names has been considered by Christian controversialists as a proof of at least a *duality* of persons in the Godhead. He, say they, who is here called *the angel of Jehovah* is after called *Jehovah* himself. He is, therefore, at the same time the angel or messenger of God the Father, and himself God the Son, equal to God the Father; since he is called by the same name. Such a mode of argumentation could not, I think, be used by any one, well acquainted with the oriental idioms. God is said to speak, act, command, threaten; when any messenger, whether angel or prophet, speaks and acts in his name.

I shall have another occasion to examine in what light we are to consider the very frequent appearances of God and his angels, mentioned in the Bible: at present I shall only say that, in my apprehension, there might, in this particular apparition, be no other angel or messenger, than an uncommon luminous appearance in a bush of briars; which attracted the attention of Moses, and might be considered by him as a divine call to return to Egypt for the purpose of delivering his brethren from their iron bondage. The Psalmist (Ps. 104. 4.) says "The Lord maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire his ministers:" and it is well known that the Chaldeans and other nations of antiquity imagined that the gods and other superior beings revealed themselves to mankind under the appearance of *fire*: and "so subtle and dazzling,"

* So Le Clerc, Dathe, Schulze, Rosenmüller, &c.

† Compl. εγνωσθη.

says Iamblichus "is the light which the gods shed on such occasions, that no corporeal eye can bear it *!"—the very property here ascribed to the light that appeared to Moses.—But can it be believed, that the whole dialogue, contained in this and the following chapters, is founded upon the single phenomenon of a fiery meteor or luminous appearance in a bush of briars? What may appear credible or incredible to others, I know not: but I know, that I can believe this, sooner than believe that God and Moses verbally conversed together in the manner here related, on the bare authority of a Jewish historian, who lived no one can well tell when or where: and who seems to have been as fond of the marvellous as any Jew of any age. But let every one judge for himself, as he has an undoubted right to do; and believe as much, or as little, as pleaseth him.—My belief is my own—I dictate no other man's.

1b. *From amidst the briars.* סֶמֶךְ לַבְּרִיָּה. Sep. ἐκ τοῦ βάρου. It is the same with the Arabic سَمَك; and from its frequency about *Horeb* and *Sinai*, this last mountain is supposed to have taken its name. The very bush from which God spoke, is still shewn by the Greek Monks of Saint-Basil, who dwell there, and who call it τὸ ἁγιον βάρου, *The holy briar-bush!* Horeb is one of the two summits of Sinai.—Josephus says, that it is the highest mountain of the whole region; that it abounded in excellent pastures, but that these had hitherto been untasted, from the popular idea that *the Divinity dwelled there*; on which account the shepherds were afraid to approach it †. Moses, it seems, was less scrupulous and more daring.

Ver. 3. *Let me turn aside, &c.* From these words, says Rosenmüller, it is clear, that Moses was not then dreaming, but fully *compos mentis*: "Ex his verbis apparet, Mosén non somniasse, sed mentis suæ planè compotem fuisse."—He seems to have forgotten what he had said on Jacob's vision, Gen. 32. 30. For all that is here related might just as well have happened in a dream, as what is there related concerning Jacob's *wrestling, baling, &c.*

Ver. 5. *Put off thy shoes.* It is still, in the East, considered as a mark of the highest respect, to pull off one's shoes, and approach bare-footed to pay adorations. The Egyptians were singularly attentive to this practice: and the Mohamedans still take off their shoes before they enter their mosques. A similar practice is used by the Roman Catholics, at the adoration of the cross on Good Friday: although not observed in this country.—When any one pays his respects to the king of Achem in the isle of Sumatra, he first takes off his shoes and stockings, and leaves them at the door.—When Mr. Wilkins wished to enter the inner hall of the college of the *Seeks* at Patna, he was told it was a place of worship, open to him and to all men; but at the same time intimated "that he must take off his shoes." *Asiat. Researches*, vol. i. p. 289.

Ver. 8. *Into a land flowing with milk and honey.* That is, abounding in all good things. See Bochart's *Hicroz.* l. iv. c. 12, where may be seen various examples of the same sort of pro-

* Καὶ μὴ τῆς γὰρ λεπτοτήρας τοῦ φωτός οἱ μὲν θεοὶ τοσαύτην ἐλαμπουσιν, ὥς μὴ δύνασθαι χωρεῖν αὐτὴν τοὺς σωματικούς ἐφθαλμούς. *De Myst. Iscl.* 2. c. 8. The Hindoos say that their supreme God Brahmā manifests himself in a variety of ways. "When he acts immediately, without assuming a shape, or sending forth a new emanation, as when a divine sound is heard from the sky, that manifestation is called *acśhavanāri*, an ethereal voice: when the voice proceeds from a meteor, or flame, it is said to be *agnirūpi*, or formed of fire." *Asiat. Researches*, vol. iii. p. 145, 146. † See *Antiq.* l. ii. c. 12. n. 1.

verbal expression in the Greek and Latin poets. Every school-boy has admired the beautiful lines of Ovid :

Flumina jam lactis, jam flumina nectaris ibant ;
Flavaque de viridi stillabant ilice mella.

On the natural fertility of Palestine, see Reland lib. i. c. 57. and an excellent Tract, already quoted, by Warnekros, in the 15th vol. of Eichhorn's *Biblical Repertory*.

Ver. 14. *I will be what I will be.* *אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי*. These three words are variously rendered in the Ant. versions.—Sep. *Εγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν*, *I am the Being*.—Aq. and Theod. *εἰμι, εἰμι*.—Vulg. *Sum qui sum*. Onk. Syr. and Perf. retain the Hebrew words : and so, in a paraphrastic manner, the Thargums.—Saad. *אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי לֹא יוֹלָד*, *The Eternal who ceaseth not*. To the same purport, although not exactly in the same words, Arab. Erp.—More literally Gr. Ven. *εἰμι ὅς εἰμι* : which is the very version of Pagninus, Castalio, Olcaster, Le Clerc, Dathe and others* ; and which, with Luther and our first English translators, I have adopted in my Version. In Cranmer's Bible it was changed into "I am that I am ;" which the Genevans and James's translators retained : for what reason it is hard to say. For I believe no other version agrees with them. Perhaps they had in view the *Sum qui sum* of the Vulgate : but then they badly rendered †.—Much better Purver : "I am he who am : " and, long before him, Diodati : "Sono colui che sono ;" and the French Genevan : "Je suis qui suis." To the same purpose Le Gros : "Je suis celui qui est"—all literal versions of the Vulg. *Sum qui sum* ; and equivalent to the Greek of Sep. *Εγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν* : the meaning of which might be thus expressed : "I am *He* who *exist* by myself—the only *Being* which can properly be said to *be*."—But I confess, that I have the same objection to this metaphysical refinement, which I have to the interpretation of the author mentioned in the second Note below.

There is yet one version more which deserves attention. It is that of Bate : "I will be, what I have been : " that is, I will be the same to them as I was to their forefathers ; their friend and protector.—I was once so well pleased with this translation, that, if I could have found instances where the word *אֲנִי* has the same power with converfive *vau*, of changing *future* into *past* time, I believe I should have adopted it ; or at least something similar ; namely

* Houbigant : *Ego is ero, qui olim futurus sum* ; hardly intelligible, any more than that of Le Cene : *Je serai, car je serai*.

† I have sometimes thought that they may have used the word *that* as a conjunction, for *because* : in which case they would coincide in opinion with the author of *Essays and Commentaries* ; who, after reporting the common renderings, adds : "I should rather turn the passage thus : *I am, because I am* : that is, I am without any cause of existence but in my own nature—I am self-existent, and necessarily existent. . . If any should think this version as identical a proposition as those mentioned above, I believe, on a fair trial, it will be found otherwise. Any person may truly say : *I am that*, or *what I am* ; and nobody would dispute it with him : but he could not say with the like truth *I am, because I am*, in the strict and proper sense of the word *because* : as his being is not owing to any thing inherent in it and inseparable from his existence in itself considered, but to a cause without himself, and independent on him. But with respect to God, who exists in dependence on no external cause, who is necessarily existent in the strictest sense ; no other reason can be assigned for his existence, but that he exists by a necessity of nature : he exists, and will exist, because of, or by reason of, his self-existence—he hath existed—he doth exist, and he will exist—he *must* exist, and *cannot* cease to exist, is all that can be said of existence."—I have no doubt but some of my readers will relish this mode of interpretation.—To me it appears too metaphysical.

"I am what I have *always* been:"—the same immutable Being. But as I have not been able to find a single example of such a converse power, I deemed it better to translate literally: "I will be, what I will be:" and leave to commentators to find as much mystery in the terms, as they please.—I will only subjoin the sensible remark of Dathe, which I have partly expressed in my Explanatory Note. "*Hæc verba non sunt nomen, quod Deus sibi tribuat; nam in sequenti versu se Jovam vocat; neque usquam legitur EIEH ut nomen Dei. Sed hic sensus esse videtur: Quocunque me nomine appellent Israelitæ, præstabo me et exhibebo ut Deum.*"

The repetition of *I will be*, יְהוָה, in the same verse is only an abridgment of the former *I will be what I will be*; thus well explained by Rosenmüller: "*Ille Deus qui dixit mihi, quum rogarem nomen ejus, Ero, qui ero; is Deus, inquam, me misit ad vos.*"—Houbigant indeed exclaims against the present reading, as a barbarism: and, instead of יְהוָה *I will be*, reads יְהוֹה, the participle called *benoni*, with the relative prefix ה: which he thinks was the reading of Sep. and Vulg. the former rendering *δ ων*, the latter *qui est*. But these are weak reasons for departing from the present reading, which is in all the copies of both Sam. and Hebr. and was certainly read by Syr. Onk. Tharg. and Perf. as they all retain the very Hebrew word; and by Gr. Ven. which has *εσσομαι προσομιση με προς υμεις*. Nay, I suspect all the other translators to have read in the same manner*. That the Septuagint read יְהוָה, their translating it into *δ ων* is no proof. They had done the same by יְהוֹה, in the preceding comma. With regard to the *qui est* of Jerom, it is certainly a more literal rendering of יְהוֹה than of יְהוָה: but we know his manner of translating too well, to affirm, that he *must* have read the former in his copy.

Ver. 15. *He that will be.* יְהוָה. This is still a play upon the foregoing words: only the third person is used instead of the first, and the *jod* converted into a *vau* to give it the form of a noun. The Rabbis indeed tell us, that there is much mystery in all this; and that the word יְהוָה includes all time, past, present, and to come. The *jod* indicates the future, the *cholem* the present, and the *kametz*, forsooth, the past: and this, say our Christian commentators, is expressed in the Revelation of John, by *δ ων, και δ ην, και δ ερχομενος*†.—It is not unlikely, that the author of the Apocalypse might have adopted this idea from the Rabbis of his day: but I doubt much if it ever were in the mind of the writer of Exodus; any more than the absurd notion, that the word יְהוָה was not to be pronounced.—But how was it pronounced? That, indeed, I know not: for the superstition of the latter Jews, I mean after the Babylonish Captivity‡, having every where substituted for it, in pronunciation, the word אֲדֹנָי *Adonai*; and the Greek interpreters having always rendered it *Κυριος*: we have no sufficient means left to enable us to know how it was originally pronounced. Its common modern pronunciation is *Jehovah*; which Bate

* The readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion are lost: and Saadiah omits the whole comma.

† From Plutarch (*De Iside*) we learn, that an inscription on the temple of an Egyptian Goddess, which he imagines to have been Minerva, was couched in these terms: "I am all that was, and is, and is to be: and no mortal has removed my veil."—And in the Text of the *Bhāgavat*, the following words are believed to have been pronounced by the Supreme Being to Brahmā: "Even I was even at first, not any other thing; that which exists, unperceived; Supreme: afterwards *I am that which is*; and he, who must remain, am I." Literal version by Sir William Jones, in *Asiat. Researches*, vol. 1. p. 245.

‡ At least before Josephus, who expressly says that it was not lawful for him to speak of the name by which God had revealed himself to Moses, *περι τῆς [προσηγορίας] ου μοι θεμις εστιν*.

and most of our later translators have every where substituted for *the Lord*.—Of foreign versions, the Tigurine has *Jehovah*; Junius, Le Clerc, and Michaëlis, *Jehova**; Castalio, Dathe, and most of the latter Germans, *Jova*.—I believe that not one of all these is the original pronunciation of יהוה.—Diodorus Siculus† says, that Moses called the author of his laws IAO—τον Ιωω. Alex. Trallianus gives us a charm or exorcism against the gout in these words: “I adjure thee by the great name of ΙΑΟΤΗ Sabaoth, Ιωω‡ Σαβωωθ.—Sanchroniathon|| says, that what he wrote concerning the Jews, he had from Jerombal, a priest of the God Ιωω. This I consider as nearly the genuine pronunciation: for I am greatly inclined to believe that before the Babylonish captivity the Jews of Palestine pronounced the word IEUE: but from their residence among the Chaldeans, who spoke, if I may so say, a Doric dialect, and used the η where the Hebrews used the η; the latter came gradually to give into a similar pronunciation; and although in their Hebrew Scriptures they retained the *be*, yet they gave it in reality the power of an *aleph*. Hence the punctuators marked it with a *kametz*. This is mere conjecture, I allow; but it is a conjecture, which I have endeavoured to make highly probable, in my *Comparative Grammar* of the Oriental Tongues; which I hope to have yet the means and leisure of giving to the Public.

But to return to יהוה. Jerom tells us, in his Comment. on Ps. 8. that the name of the Lord in Hebrew is composed of the letters *jod, be, vau, be*; and may be read IAHU; which corresponds with the Ιωω of Diodorus.—We learn from Photius, Ep. 162. that the Jews pronounced it AIA; but the Samaritans IABE, i. e. IAVE. He adds: γραφεται δε γραμμασι τούτοις: Ιωβ, αλφ, ουαυ, ηβ: where remark that the θ in the two last letters is paragogic; as in Ιωωθ, mentioned in the last note but one below. It is worthy of remark, that in the Constantinopolitan edition of a Spanish version made by the Jews the word יהוה is thus expressed IEÏA: but which, in the Ferrara edition of the same work is changed into *Adonai*. See Le Long, vol. 1. p. 365.—The oblique cases of the Latin *Jupiter*, particularly the ablative *Iove*, seems to be derived from יהוה.—So much on the pronunciation of יהוה.—Let us next see how it has been rendered by those translators, who chose not to retain the name itself.—Sep. δ Κυριος.—Vulg. Dominus.—Onk. Tharg. and Persic η.—Syr. כדון.—The Sam. version and both Arabs generally change it into words that denote *God*.—Gr. Ven. Ουιωτης.—Most moderns have, from Pagninus downward, followed the Antients: and express יהוה by *Dominus, the Lord*.—The French Genevans have *l'Eternel*; and Le Cene, *le Souverain*.

I have, with all our English versions prior to the present century, preferred *the LORD*; for two reasons: First, the word *Jehovah* is a barbarous sound authorized by no authority, save the very ambiguous one of the vowel-points; and is made much more barbarous by our mode of pronouncing it: for we should write and speak either *Jehovah*, as we pronounce *Iambic*; or write with the Welch *Yehovah*.—But, in truth, we have learned from the French to murder every Hebrew, Greek, and Latin name which begins by the letter *I* followed by a vowel: as *Jacob, Jeremiab, John, Jerom*; and even the venerable name *JESUS*. Secondly, because we

* In the Greek *Catechism* or *Orthodox Confession of Faith*, the name is written Ιεχωα: from a very common mutation of the Hebrew *be* into *chi*, and *vau* into *beta*. † L. i. p. 48. ‡ The θ in Ιωωθ is a mere paragogic, not unusual among the Greeks.

|| Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 9.

cannot with any propriety translate the *Kyrios* of the New Test. by *Jehovah*: even in the quotations from the Old: for these are almost all made from the Septuagint version. Since then the *Kyrios* of the N. T. where it denotes the Supreme Being, is the same with *יהוה* of the Old, which the Jews themselves in their earliest version render *Kyrios*; is it not better to retain this latter throughout a vernacular translation of both, than to write and read *Jehovah* in the one, and *the Lord* in the other, as if they were two different Gods?

Ib. *This shall be my name for ever.* This, I think, alludes not to *יהוה*, but to the titles preceding: *the God of Abraham*, &c. The meaning I take to be this; that whatsoever name I am called by, all future generations shall know me by the name of the *God of Abraham*, the *God of Isaac* and the *God of Jacob*.

Ib. *And this my memorial.* *זכר*. It is not easy to express the full force of the word *זכר*. Hence Michaëlis and Dathe were content with paraphrasing thus: "und so will ich zu allen zeiten genaunt werden"—"*Sic, per omnes ætates, me vocabitis*:" as if it were only a repetition of the preceding comma. But it is, certainly, more than that: it is admirably well expressed by the *μνηστικόν* of Sep. which is also the rendering of Gr. Ven.: but not quite so well by Jerom's *memoriale*; which, however, our translators borrowed for want of a more explicit term. Perhaps *remembraunce* might not improperly be substituted. The name of the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* was to be a continual pledge for his protecting their posterity, as his own peculiar people: for in that light the Hebrew historian meant the words to be taken.

Ver. 18. *The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, is the God whom we invoke.* The present Hebrew has *יהוה אלהי העברים נקרא עלינו*; which, in our common version, is rendered: "The Lord God of the Hebrews *hath met with us*." But all the Samaritan copies, and 27 Heb. mss. and the Text itself in p. p. ch. 5. 3.* have a different reading, namely *נקרא* the passive voice of *קרא*, instead of *נקרא*. I know the two verbs are sometimes confounded in the present Text; and that *קרא* has the meaning of *קרא* about 18 times in the whole Hebrew Scripture; but neither of these verbs, in the signification of *meeting* or *befalling*, is ever constructed with the preposition *על*; whereas *קרא*, when it means to *call*, *invoke*, is in its passive voice or Niphal most frequently so constructed; and always, I believe, when it is used to express the relation between God and his people. So Deut. 28. 10. *שם יקרא נקרא עליך*, rendered by our English translators "Thou art called by the name of the Lord," i. e. The Lord is he, whom thou invokest, and worshipping. So Jerem. 14. 9. *ושם עלינו נקרא* *Thy name is called upon us*. See also 2 Chron. 7. 14. If. 63. 19. Amos 9. 12. Dan. 9. 18.—This consideration alone determines the true reading *נקרא* and its true meaning here; without the aid of mss. or any other authority. Onk. and Jonathan so read and understood: for they have both *אתקרי עלנו* *invocatus est super nos*, in the same sort of construction as the Hebrew; although the Latin translator of Tharg. has falsely rendered *occurrit nobis*.—The Septuagint and Jerom seem either to have read *קרא לנו*, or to have given a conjectural and uncommon meaning to the present reading; as the former render *προσκληθησάαι ἡμᾶς*; the latter *vocavit nos*: but still they must have taken the verb *קרא* not in the sense of *meeting*—but of *calling* or *invoking*.—And indeed any other sense appears to me absurd. For what sense is there in saying: "The God of the Hebrews (*i. e.* our own God)

* Where, however, 6 mss. have *נקרא*.

"hath met with us?"—Hence those interpreters who seem to have had the reading הָיָה before them have been obliged to distort it to meanings which it cannot admit. Thus Syr. and Arab. *Erp. hath revealed himself to us. Saad. hath given us a charge.* And, among the moderns, *Dathe: apparuit nobis. Michaëlis: "ist uns erschienen."*—How much more sensibly Luther followed the Vulg. and Sep. "*hat uns gerufen;*" which, at least, makes a congruous sense: although the present reading can hardly bear it.—On the whole, then, I am clearly of opinion that the meaning of the comma is: "We adore not, nor invoke the deities of Egypt—The God of the Hebrews, is the God who is invoked by us: let us therefore go at some distance: from the Egyptians, that we may without molestation worship our own God, after our own manner."

Ver. 19. *But by compulsion.* Lit. *but by a strong hand.* The present Hebr. Text has, *not even by a strong hand*, $\text{וְלֹא בְיָד חֲזָקָה}$; which the sticklers for its integrity defend thus: the *strong hand* is the first nine plagues, which were not effectual to obtain permission for the Israelites to go out of Egypt! But the *tenth* produced that effect. This is truly an odd manner of defending a manifest blunder; of which there is not, as far as I recollect, a single similar example.—Read וְלֹא הָיָה or וְלֹא הָיָה with Sam. Sep. and Vulg.—The error crept into the Hebrew Text, from the great resemblance of *he* and *vau* in the old alphabet.—An hundred instances of a like commutation might be pointed out.

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 6. *PUT thine hand into thy bosom.* The robes of the Easterns are wide, and tied about the middle with a cincture, which leaves above a capacious sinuosity of superfluous cloth, not ineptly called a *bosom*. The Latins used *sinus* in the same sense.

Ver. 16. *As a mouth,* וְכַדָּן . Thus Homer is, by the sweet bard Mœchus, called *the mouth of Calliophæ*—

$\text{ὀμιλεῖτο πρὸς τοὶ Ὀμηροῦ}$

$\text{Τὸν το Καλλιόπης γλῶσσαν ὀμιλεῖ.$

Epitaph. Bion. 73. 74.

1b. *Thou shalt to him be as a God.* $\text{וְהָיָה לְךָ לְפָנָיו כְּאֵלִים}$. Thus paraphrased by Sep. *su de ante te in facie eius*; imitated by Jerom.; *Tu autem eris ei in his quæ ad Deum pertinent*: but neither version expresses the original. Better Gr. Ven. *su de ὑπαρχῶν ἐναντὶ εὐς Θεοῦ*. Onk. Perf. and both Arabs change the word *God* into equivalents: $\text{בִּי-וְהָיָה לְךָ לְפָנָיו כְּמֹלֶךְ}$ — מֹלֶךְ *master, instructor, preceptor*; all mollified terms, to exclude the idea of *godship* from Moses: but this was not necessary, as the word וְהָיָה *God* is expressive of *superior power*, wherever it be lodged. Hence the Syr. translator scrupled not to render it here by וְהָיָה .

Ver. 21. *I will so barden his heart, &c.* $\text{וְלִבִּי גָמַלְתִּי בְּעַמִּי}$. Sep. *ego de oculis meis in cor ejus*. Vulg. *ego indurabo cor ejus*: and to the same purport all the Antient versions; save that Syr. Aquila and Sym. mollify the term גָּמַלְתִּי a little— וְעָשִׂיתִי — וְעָשִׂיתִי — וְעָשִׂיתִי . Gr. Ven. κατασφύξω .—All this sounds harsh to our ear, as it seems to make God the author of sin: and our

* This term used by Saadiah is Persian, not Arabic.

Theologians have been at much pains to shew, that it is a *more-oriental mystery*. Those who wish to see all that can well be said on the subject may consult Dathe's edition of Glaffius's *Philologia Sacra*, l. 1. p. 242. or Rosenmüller's *Scholia*, vol. i. p. 379.—After all it now to me appears, that the ~~more~~ *more* ancient Jews, I mean before the Babylonish captivity, really believed that all *evil* as well as *good* came immediately from God. I was once of a different opinion; which I have too strongly expressed in my Explanatory Note; which, consequently, is at variance with this Remark. But I always write from actual conviction, and shall never be ashamed to acknowledge my known errors and mistakes. See the C. R. on 2 Sam. 24. 1. and compare ch. 14. 17.—Deut. 2. 30.: 4. 19. & 18. 14.: 29. 25.—Josh. 8. 20.—2 Sam. 14. 10.—2 K. 3. 10.—Isa. 44. 18.—Jerem. 4. 10.—Ezek. 14. 9.: 20. 25.: 39. 2.—Ps. 105. 25.—But the fatalism of the Jews cannot arraign the goodness or justice of the Deity, any more than the fatalism of the Greeks and Mahomedans.—At any rate, whether the Jews were fatalists or not, a translator should not take the liberty to change his Text, under pretence of reconciling it to modern Theology, as Dathe has done: "Ego vero *permittam*, ut animo ob-
"firmato populum demittere recuset."—Much more properly Michaëlis: "Ich aber will sein
"herz verharten." See his excellent Note on this passage in his German Version of the Bible.

Ver. 22. *Israel is my son, my first-born*. A strong metaphor, denoting that the Lord considered the Israelites as his favourite chosen people. Hence Sep. in the next comma renders בן *my son* by *אבא אבא מונ*, *my people*.

Ver. 24. *The Lord met him*, &c. The word rendered *met* is not קרא, but פגש, which in Arab. signifies *irruere*; and in this sense it is here taken by Saadias: "The Lord, or (as Sep. Onk. Tharg. and both Arabs have it) "the angel of the Lord, *attacked* him," &c.—This angel or messenger was, no doubt, some sudden dangerous malady, which happened to Moses in his journey from Midian to Egypt, probably at the very first lodging-place he came to: and as all maladies were supposed to be the punishment of some transgression*, it was natural to impute this one to the neglect of *circumcision*; which the mother, with reluctance, now performs, to save her husband's life.

Ver. 25. *A sharp knife*. Better, perhaps, *a sharp stone*, or *flint*, צור: for flints and shells were antiently used as knives and other edged tools; and, at this day, such knives are used in circumcision by some Æthiopian tribes.

Ib. *Throwing herself at his feet*. The Text is ותנו לרגליו, *and touched his feet*. Whose feet? Those of Moses, say the generality of interpreters—Those of her son, say De Lyra and Bonfrerius.—Drusus, Glaffius, and Rosenmüller likewise refer רגליו to the son; but think it means here not the *feet*, but the *part* that had been just circumcised, and still reeking with blood; a very fanciful and far-fetched interpretation.—More absurd still is the opinion of some Rabbis and the Thargumists, that the feet of the threatening angel are here designated.—With respect to ותנו, or as 4 Sam. mss. have it, ותנו, I have without the smallest hesitation followed Sep. προσεπεσε προς τους ποδας αυτου. The Vulg. *tetigit pedes ejus*, and the Syr. *אחזת ברגליו*

* This idea remained among the Jews long after their return from Babylon. "Which sinned?" said the disciples of Jesus;—"this man? or his parents? that he was born blind!" John 9. 2.

she laid hold of his feet, are indeed more literal, but have the same meaning. Ziphora placed herself in the same attitude with regard to Moses, as the two Marys did with regard to Jesus, when he met them after his resurrection: "They laid hold of his feet, and worshipped him." Mat. 28. 9.—The conduct of Ziphora was that of a tender mother, and a loving respectful wife: her speech is not a speech of reproach or indignation, but of uxorial endearment. By these words "a blood-bought spouse art thou to me" she seems to say: See how dearly I love thee! since, for thy sake, I have sacrificed the blood of my son, contrary to my maternal feelings and the practice of my country!—I know that some commentators, among whom our Stackhouse, refer the word *spouse* to the child: and "this (says Delgado) alludes to a custom among the Jews, of calling a child that is circumcised a bridegroom*." Aben-Ezrah held the same opinion; justly scouted by Houbigant and Secker; whose *ms.* note on the passage I here subjoin. "It is wonderful (says he), if Moses wrote this account, that he should not have added explanatory circumstances. Possibly the son here mentioned was but lately born, and since Moses received his commission; and his mother had opposed his being circumcised at the regular time, because of the journey: which reason Moses might see to be insufficient; yet, through excess of tenderness, comply with her desire: and it being material, that he who went on such a high message, should be accurate and exemplary in observing the law of God, God might appear to him in a threatening manner, and to Zipporah at the same time; which might well bring her to perform the command, in the haste here described, though not without words expressing uneasiness. Some think that she calls him *bridegroom*, as having by this action saved his life, and secured him to herself anew. Houbigant observes well, that she could not, as some imagine, call her son *bridegroom*, as being by circumcision espoused to God: for God is never represented as the female spouse."—For the rest, Houbigant suspected that a *jod* may have been dropped out of the word *בנות*, and that the original reading was *בנותיו* *her sons*. It is clear from ver. 20. that Moses took both his sons with him; and it is not improbable that both of them were then uncircumcised†; otherwise it would not have been a novelty to Ziphora.—If *בנות* were the genuine reading, it would certainly leave no ambiguity in the Text, as the affix in *רליו* could then be referable to Moses only: but there is no variety of lection either in the Sam. or Heb. copies; and all the Versions have also the singular.—I am inclined to think that the singular here stands for the plural; as *אסר* *an ass*, in v. 20. evidently signifies *several asses*; and as *עץ* in Gen. 1. 11. denotes all sorts of trees.

Ver. 26. The Lord then let him escape. *וירחצו*. Lit. *and he departed from him*. Now, as no explicit nominative is prefixed to the verb, it has been differently supplied. The Ant. versions

* Delgado's version is: "Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, which reached his feet: then she said, &c."—I add, on account of its peculiarity, the version of Bate: "And Ziphoreh took a knife, and cut off the foreskin of her son; and she laid it at his feet; and said: Surely thou art a father by blood to me." On which he has this curious Note: "More was explained to them on this occasion, than is mentioned, as is plain because Ziphora knew what would appease Jehovah, viz. circumcision; for when she laid the foreskin at the feet of Jehovah, he desisted from his attempt on Moses; and Jehovah was now father to her, the mother of the children of God by the blood of the circumcision." Rare mode of interpreting, this! † The Bab. Thargum, indeed, tells us, that Eliezer had been circumcised in consequence of an agreement between Moses and his father-in-law; but that the latter would not allow Gershom to undergo that operation.

leave the word in the same ambiguity, save that the Complut. edition of Sep. and the Oxford ms. have ὁ ἀγγελος; and so it was understood by the Thargumists. Delgado supplies it, that is, the malady, "which is understood, though not expressed:" and this is a common interpretation among the Jews. De Lyra, Estius, and even the great Grotius imagined that the nominative is Ziphora, and accordingly, render *she left him*; i. e. she returned to her father's house. But they attended not to the little circumstance of the verb's being masculine, without any variety of lection, save that one faulty ms. has ἦν.—That Ziphora returned with the children to her father's house is indeed certain, from ch. 18. 2. and it is highly probable, that she returned on this occasion; but this cannot be inferred from the verb here used; nor can it refer to her at all. Grotius must not have consulted the original; but was deceived by the Greek ἀπῆλθεν, or by Pagninus's *recessit*; both which admit equally a feminine or masculine nominative.—I am firmly of opinion, then, that *the Lord*, or *the angel*, is the nominative to be supplied, although I am persuaded that the phrase means no more, than that the malady was not mortal, and was now come to a happy crisis.

Before I leave this verse, I must make one remark more, on the very singular manner in which the words לִי הָיָה דָּמָם בְּחֵן are rendered in Sep. namely, ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς τοῦ παιδὸς μου. How they could draw this out of the Hebrew, is inconceivable; even if we suppose them to have read דָּמָם for בְּחֵן: for how can לִי הָיָה דָּמָם be converted, by any means, into τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς τοῦ παιδίου μου, *the blood of my child's circumcision*? It baffles all conjecture. Such another wild paraphrase is not, I think, to be found in all the Greek Version; at least in the Pentateuch. Yet this wild paraphrase is in all the editions, and in all the mss. which I have had occasion to see; as also in the Copt. and Ital. versions, made from the Greek. It is thus quoted by Austin: "Stetit sanguis circumcisionis infantis mei."—Perhaps some of Dr. Holmes's mss. will give us some variety of lection; although I have little hopes of their clearing up the matter.—I just now learn from Dr. Holmes himself, that there is no important variety of reading.

Ver. 27. *And kissed him.* וְיָשָׁק. Sep. Vat. Compl. Alex. have κατεφιλήσαν αλλήλους, *they kissed one another*. But Ald. and 28 mss. have κατεφιλήσαν αὐτον: and so Copt. This then is probably the genuine reading.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 3. *LET us go, &c.* This was a mere pretext; but well calculated to induce Pharaoh to comply with so fair a demand: for it was a common opinion among all the nations of antiquity, that the neglect of sacrifices and religious festivals was punished by war, pestilence, and other calamities; nor did the Hebrew legislator attempt to remove a prejudice so deeply rooted; as the attempt in all probability would have been vain. *The worshipping of God in spirit and truth*, was a doctrine not yet known: to our divine legislator, Jesus, it was reserved to promulge so pure a religious worship; whose followers, however, too soon lost sight of it, and judaized, I might say paganized, even in the first ages of Christianity; or, at least, as soon as Christianity became the established religion of the State.

Ver. 6. *Inferiour officers.* סֹפְרֵי. Sep. γραμματεῖς, *Scribes*. They, no doubt, kept a register of

of the labourers, and portioned out their several tasks: but they were accountable to their Egyptian taskmasters, נַסִּים.

Ver. 7. *Straw to make brick.* The straw was chopped small, and mixed with the clay, to give it a greater coherence. Our mud-walls are formed of similar materials, although these are not worked into bricks, but layered into one mass. Those bricks were not burned in kilns, but dried in the sun. See Harmer, vol. i. p. 176.

Ver. 9. *That to it they may attend.* The present Hebrew Text has וְיָצְאוּ *et faciant in eo*; what our translators render "that they may labour therein." But I prefer the Sam. reading וְיָצְאוּ, which was that of Sep. Onk. Syr. Tharg. and Saadiah; and is far more agreeable to the context.

Ver. 14. Some have imagined that וְכָל הַיּוֹם, in this verse, is an interpolation; and the Sep. version seems to favour this opinion; as it has only καθότι χρεὶς καὶ τριῆν ἡμέρας, καὶ τὸ σημεῖον. So also Vulg. *sicut prius, nec heri, nec hodie.* But the words are in all the copies of Sam. and Heb. and in all the other Ant. versions; although they disappear in the Polyglott Latin version of Onkelos: so that there is little doubt, I think, of their having originally stood in the Text. The first וְכָל הַיּוֹם refers to time past in general, the second וְכָל הַיּוֹם to the preceding day.

Ver. 16 *Although the fault be in thine own people.* The original, וְכָל הַחַטָּאת, is ambiguous, and has been variously understood and rendered. The Septuagint took חַטָּאת for the second pers. sing. of חָטָא, and עַל for a noun: ἀδικήσεις ὡς τὸν λαόν σου "Thou wrongest thy people." So equivalently Vulg. and Syr.† and one of Kennicott's mss. וְכָל־ seems to favour this reading. But all the other copies, both Heb. and Sam. have וְכָל־ or וְכָל־; neither of which admits easily the above Greek version.—Onk. Tharg. Perf. and both Arabs either read וְכָל חַטָּאת *populus tuus peccat*; or considered חַטָּאת as a noun, although they rendered it as a verb: and this, I think, is the more probable, as Aquila, a most verbal translator, has καὶ ἀμαρτία λαοῦ σου; and Theod. καὶ ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐστὶν τοῦ λαοῦ σου; which however is a somewhat ambiguous version, and may be constrained to bear a meaning similar to that of Sep. Symmachus took עַל for a preposition, and renders accordingly, though not literally, καὶ ἀμαρτίαν ἔχεις. So the Sam. version וְכָל חַטָּאת *The fault is with thee.* But Houbigant, I believe, is the only modern, of any note, who has adopted this meaning: *Et culpa ad teipsum redundat.* It is not at all probable, that the Israelites would lay the blame directly on the sovereign, but rather on his servants.

There is another interpretation, first broached by Pagninus, and followed by Luther, Castalio, Drufius, the Genevans*, Diodati, and most vernacular translators. They suppose חַטָּאת to be here taken for the *punishment of sin*; and render "*et punitur populus tuus*"—"thus thy people are punished;" or some such term. Luth. "und dein volk muß sündler seyn." Diod. "et il tuo popolo è inculpato."—I have little doubt, that חַטָּאת is here to be considered as a noun in *regimen* with עַל, and that this latter signifies *people*: so that the literal version would in Latin be, "tamen, peccatum est populi tui;"—or, as the Greek version of Venice well has it, ἡ δὲ ἀμαρτία τοῦ σου λαοῦ†.

* That is, the first Geneva editions: which have "Ton peuple est puni, comme ayant péché:" but in the last revival, the comma is well rendered "et c'est la faute de ton peuple." Well the Spanish of Ferrara, made by some Jews: "y es pecado de tu pueblo."

† This translator often attitudinizes.

Ver. 17. I have added the words *our God*,* in this verse, on the authority of one Ms. and Sep. although the latter has only *עַל שְׁמֵי יְהוָה*†, without *Kaph*. It is a repetition of part of v. 3. and would most probably be originally expressed in the same manner. Four Heb. mss. with Tharg. Arab. Exp. and one of De Rossi's mss. of Onk. have *our God*, instead of *the Lord*. I am persuaded, therefore, that *יהוה* stood originally in the Text after *יהוה*.

Ver. 19. *Not aught shall be diminished*. The present Text has *לֹא יִמְנָס*, *ye shall not diminish*: but I prefer the Sam. reading *יִמְנָס*; which Jerom followed:—*non-minuetur*. The other Ant. interpreters, however, read in the plural. It is all the same as to the sense: although I think the Sam. reading more idiomatical.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 2. *AGAIN the Lord spoke*. The present Text has *יהוה* God, and so Sep. both Arabs and Gr. Ven. But Sam. Syr. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. and 2 of De Rossi's mss. have *יהוה*; and 1 Ms. has *יהוה יהוה the Lord God*.

Ver. 3. *Who manifested myself to Abraham, &c. as God the Omnipotent*. *בְּאֵל שֵׁט*. Although I have, with Jerom and the bulk of modern interpreters, rendered the word *שֵׁט* *Omnipotent*, I am far from thinking that this is certainly its meaning. The antients vary in rendering it. Sep. *Θεός ως αὐτὸς*, "*as being their God*."—What they saw in their copy, it is difficult to say. —Syr. Onk. Tharg. Bab. and Perf. retain the Hebrew word *שֵׁט*. Tharg. Jer. has *אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיִם* *the God of the heavens*; and so the word is rendered in Sep. in the Psalms: *ὁ Θεός τῶ ἀναρῶν*, and *ὁ ἐξουσιῶν*—Both Arabs have words denoting *superior power*—*self-sufficiency*; and Jerom has *in Deo omnipotente*. The Greek of Venice: *ὁ Σεξ. κραιναῖος*. Michaëlis hesitates between two significations. The first he derives from the Arab. *سَمَاء*, which in one of its inflections signifies *ascendit summum rei—in summo confedit*. In this case *שֵׁט* will be *he who sits the highest, summi cæli seffor*; and equivalent to *עֶלְיוֹן* *the Most High*. He has, accordingly, in his German Version, rendered it "*allerhöchste*."—Dathe: *summi*.—But as the same Arab. word signifies *to weave; texere, flamina ducere*; *שֵׁט* may mean the *great weaver* or *worker* of all created things: "*Deus, creans omnia et regens, flamina ducere omnium rerum dicitur*†." To me this etymon appears too far-fetched.—Ekenius derives the word from the Arab. *قُوَّة*, which denotes *power, validus fuit, prævaluit*. This coincides with Vulg. and so it is often rendered in Sep. in the book of Job, *κραιναῖος*—and in Ezech. *κραιναῖος* by Theodotion. The Greek of Venice agrees in the idea of *power*; but he seems to have taken *שֵׁט* for *power itself*; not for the *God of power*: as if the meaning were: "*I manifested myself to Abraham, &c. in power divine*||.—I have already observed that most moderns have adopted Jerom's version; particularly all our English translators before Bate; who renders *שֵׁט* *all-bountiful*. He derives the word from *שָׂדֶה* *to pour forth*: "*q. d. the pourer or shedder forth of blessings, both temporal and spiritual*."

* Compl. has *עַל שְׁמֵי יְהוָה*.

† Some have imagined they read, at least in Gen. 28. 3. and 49. 14. not *שֵׁט* but *שָׁל*, for *שָׁל* *יהוה*, because they render it *Θεός μόνος*; but besides that it is not clear that ever *שָׁל* stands for *יהוה* in the Pentateuch, the Septuagint could not here read *שָׁל*, as they render *Θεός ως αὐτὸς*; and Gen. 18. 1. *Θεός εἷς*.

‡ Michaëlis Supplem. p. 2284.

|| "*Hebraismus est (says Munster) pro omnipotentia divina*." So also Clarus.

—Oleaster thought the word might be derived from *עו* a *pap*: and that a *God of paps* means a bountiful nourishing God. This accords with Bate's and Parkhurst's interpretation.—Some few have made *עו* a compound of *ע* and *ו*; and render *he who is sufficient*. This is, in my apprehension, the least probable of all derivations.—Let me now add my own conjectures; on which, however, I lay little stress. I once thought I had found the original meaning of *עו* in the Syr. *עו* *promisit*: and if this were really the root, the sense here would be, that God had manifested himself to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob only as a *promiser* of good things: but that now he would be what he then promised.—But, perhaps, a still better etymon may be found in the Ethiopic SADI, which signifies *benignity*: so that *עו* *אל* may denote a *benign, bounteous God*; which version coincides with Bate's, although drawn from a different origin.—*Verbum non amplius addam.*

Ib. *But my name IEVE [Jehovah] to them I did not manifest.* *וְשֵׁם יְהוָה לֹא נִדְעִיתִי לָהֶם.* So both Heb. and Sam. Texts without any notable variety of reading; and so, negatively, all the Ant. versions, save Saadiah, who has this singular rendering *וְשֵׁם אֱלֹהִים* *But God is my name.*—But how can the name *Jehovah* be said *not to have been manifested* to the more antient patriarchs, when it occurs so frequently in their history? With respect to the mere historical narrative, the answer is obvious: the Hebrew historian, whoever he was, to whom the name *Jehovah* was known, might without any impropriety use it proleptically in speaking of the patriarchs, and even in writing the history of the creation. But there are passages where the patriarchs themselves are found addressing their God under the very name *Jehovah*; which they could not have done, if it had been unknown to them! Certainly not, and here lies the great difficulty in explaining the present passage. Two principal expedients have, by commentators, been employed to remove the difficulty. 1. It has been supposed, that *לֹא* is here equivalent to *וְלֹא*; and that the comma should be rendered: “and by my name Jehovah was I not manifested to them?” But this interpretation is not only contrary to the common rules of grammar, but destroys the analogy of the context:—and would never have been thought of, but for the sake of reconciling contradictions.—Another more subtle solution is given by Vatable, and retailed by Dathe and Rosenmüller. I shall give it in the very words of Vatable: “Quòd si quis contendat nomen *יהוה* fuisse etiam patribus ante Moysen cognitum et usitatum; nihilominus tamen erit bujus loci sententia, quòd Deus promiserit quidem patribus terram Chanaan, non tamen impleverit temporibus patrum: nunc autem reipsa impleturus sit; ut confirmetur veritas nominis sui, quo dicitur *יהוה*, i. e. *conficiens, constans, firmus et verax in promissionibus suis.* In hanc sententiam quidam etiam magni nominis apud Hebræos exponit locum istum in hæc verba: ‘Promisi eis promissiones, et in omnibus eis dixi ad eos: Ego sum Deus omnipotens: at in nomine meo *יהוה* non sum notus factus eis. Hic non scribitur *Non notum feci*, sed *Non notus factus sum*: i. e. *non cognitus factus sum eis in proprietate veritatis meæ, propter quam vocatur nomen meum יהוה*; i. e. *VERAX, FIDELIS, CONSTANS: quia ecce promisi eis, et nondum præstiti, seu confirmavi.*” Such is the amphibological language which eminent Jewish and eminent Christian interpreters put in the mouth of the Lord.—But what then are we to say of those passages where the patriarchs address the Lord by his name *Jehovah*? We must say that they are corrupted passages, and that *יהוה* has slipped into them for *אלוהים* or *אדני*. It is well known how often these words have been interchanged; and what variety of lection is in different copies, with respect to them.

them.—But let us review the several passages where the name *Jehovah* is put in the mouths of the patriarchs, before Moses.—The first instance is an early one indeed: it is in Gen. 4. 1. where Heva is made to say קָרַיתִי אֱלֹהִים אֶת יְהוָה, literally, “I have gotten a man *Jehovah*,” or, as some render, “from *Jehovah*.” But here Sep. Vulg. and both Arabs have *God* instead of *Jehovah*: and I have no doubt that this is the genuine reading. See the Rem. on the place.—The next instance is that of Noah, Gen. 9. 26. who in his benediction of Shem says: בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ commonly rendered “Blessed be the Lord God of Shem:” but which I render “Blessed of ‘the Lord be Shem!’” leaving *the Lord* in the version, because it is in all the Hebrew and Samaritan copies, and in all the versions save the two Arabs: but believing it a real interpolation, as I have said in my Rem. on that place.

The third instance is in Gen. 15. 2. where Abraham is made to say אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה *My Lord Jehovah*. But here there is a variety of lection to which I refer my reader at p. 94. of these Remarks. The same words occur again ver. 8. but here also is a variety of lection both in the Text and Versions. Two ms. have “*Jehovah, my Lord*,” and two, with Vulg. Syr. Onk. have “*Lord God*.”

The fourth instance is in Gen. 16. 2. where Sara is made to say: “*Jehovah hath denied me children*,” and here indeed there is no variety of lection; save that both Arabs have “*God*.”—Again in ver. 5. the same Sara says: “*May Jehovah be judge between me and thee*,” but here all the copies of Sep. as well as both Arabs, have “*God*.”

In Gen. 19. 13. the angels say to Lot: “*So great before Jehovah, &c.*” and “*Jehovah hath sent us, &c.*” and here the Arabs only have “*God*.” In ver. 14. Lot uses the same term, speaking to his sons-in-law; where again the Arabs only have “*God*.”

In Gen. 22. 14. Abraham is made to call the altar which he builded on Mount Moria “*JEVE-IRAE*” *Jehovah will provide*: and here all the versions, save the Arabs, have also “the *Lord*.”

In Gen. 24. 3. Abraham adjures his servant by “*Jehovah*,” nor is there here any variety of lection, save in the Arabs.—The same is the case in ver. 7. where Abraham says: “*Jehovah, the God of the heavens, &c.*”

In ver. 12. Abraham’s servant says: “*O Jehovah, the God of my master, &c.*” But here 2 mss. have *Adoni* instead of *Jehovah*, and 1 ms. has *Adoni Jehovah*. The Arabs, as usual, have “*O God, the God of my master, &c.*”

In ver. 27. the same servant says: “*Blessed be Jehovah, the God of my master, &c.*” where all the versions accord: except the Arabs. So again in the same verse: and in ver. 35. 40. 42. 48. 52. 56.

In Gen. 26. 28. Abimelech says to Isaac: “*We have clearly seen that Jehovah is with thee.*” Where the Arabs only have *God*: and yet it is highly improbable that a king of Palestine should use the word *Jehovah*.

In Gen. 27. 7. Isaac bids Esau bring him venison: “*That I may bless thee (says he) in the presence of Jehovah*,” where the Arabs only have *God*.—In the same Ch. ver. 20. Jacob says: “*Jehovah, thy God, put it (the venison) in my way.*” Here Vulg. has only *voluntas Dei tui*.—In ver. 27. Isaac says that the fragrance of his son’s garments is like the fragrance of a full-grown field “*which Jehovah hath blessed.*”

In Gen. 28. 20, 21. Jacob twice mentions the name *Jehovah*; according to Sep. * and once according to all the copies, save the Arabs.

In Gen. 29. 32. Lea is made to say, on the birth of Reuben: "For *Jehovah* hath given me a son." Here not only both Arabs, but also Syr. and Perf. have *God*: and indeed it is barely credible that Lea would use the name *Jehovah*.—Yet in the next verse she is made to use it again; and likewise in ver. 35.; in both which places the Perfic version, a very literal one, and both Arabs have *God*.—In Ch. 30. 18. she says: "*God* [not *Jehovah*] hath given me my reward." But here Onk.† and the Thargums have *Jehovah*.

In Gen. 30. 23. Rahel says: "*God* hath taken away my reproach:" but here Onk. and the Thargums, with 3 Heb. mss. have *Jehovah*.—Again ver. 24. she says: "May *Jehovah* add to me, &c." but Sep. Syr. Perf. and both Arabs have *God*.—In the same Ch. ver. 27. Laban says: "*Jehovah*, I guess, hath blessed me, &c." But Sep. Syr. Vulg. Perf. and both Arabs have *God*: nor is it likely that Laban, a Syrian, would use the other name.—In ver. 30. Jacob says "Through my conduct *Jehovah* blessed thee:" where some copies of Sep. Perf. and both Arabs have *God*. Some copies of Sep. have both, *Κυριος ὁ Θεος*; but most copies have *Κυριος* only.

In Gen. 31. 49. Laban says: "May *Jehovah* spy between me and thee, &c." but Sep. Perf. and both Arabs have *God*.

In Gen. 32. 9. al. 10. Jacob says "Thou, *Jehovah*, who saidst to me:" and to this agree all the versions, save the two Arabs.

In Gen. 49. 18. Jacob says, or some one for him: "Jehovah! from thee I wait for salvation:" but this has very much the air of an interpolation; as I have observed on that passage.

These, if I mistake not, are all the places where the Patriarchs, from Adam to Jacob inclusively, have directly mentioned the name *Jehovah*: and they are certainly more than enough to prove, that that name was known to them before the vocation of Moses; if we were sure that they had actually spoken the very words put in their mouths by the compilers, or copiers, of the Pentateuch. But who will affirm that this is the case? The number of places where *אלהים* and *יהוה* have been interchanged is very great; and the variety of lection between the Versions and the Text, and between the copies of the Text itself, is astonishing. Need we wonder then, that the word *יהוה*, once become the peculiar name of the God of the Hebrews, should, by historians posterior to that period, be often substituted for the more antient and more general name *אלהים*, even in addresses to the Deity, or in relations concerning him? A prolepsis is readily granted with respect to the latter‡; and we must either grant it with respect to the former, or say that the writer of Exodus is in contradiction with the writer of Genesis: for it is, in my apprehension, impossible to reconcile the passage of Exodus, that gave rise to the above

* When I marked this Var. Read. I had not seen Gr. Ven. which here agrees with Sep. having *ὁ κυριος ὁ θεος*. He must have read *יהוה* in his Hebrew copy, for he is a most literal translator. † Wrongly rendered *Deus* in the Latin version.

‡ Nothing indeed is more common than such a prolepsis. Who scruples to say that the excellent *Prelections on Hebrew Poetry* were written by Bishop Lowth; although we know he was no bishop when he composed that work? Or that Pope Benedict XIV. was the author of a celebrated work *De Canonisatione Sanctorum*; although he was only Cardinal Lambertini, when he wrote it?

observations, with the name *Jehovah's* being known to the preceding patriarchs.—If the name *Jehovah* were known before it was here communicated to Moses, and were the common appellation of the God of the Patriarchs, the question of Moses, Exod. 3. 13. was needless, was impertinent: for God had before told him, ver. 6. that he was “the God of his (Moses’s) fathers, “the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” It is clear then that Moses, by asking what was the name of this same God of his fathers, knew not that he had any particular name; and that particular name *Jehovah* is now for the first time made known as the peculiar God of the Israelitic nation. All this is perfectly conformable to the present declaration, Exod. 6. 3. “I am Jehovah; who manifested myself (or appeared) to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as God the Omnipotent *אני אל*: but my name *IEVE* (*Jehovah*) to them I did not manifest.”—In fact it is by the former name he calls himself to Abraham, Gen. 17. 1. *אני אל* “I am God, the Omnipotent.”—To Jacob, Gen. 35. 11. he makes the same declaration; which Jacob himself alludes to in his last speech to Joseph, “God, the Omnipotent, appeared to me “at Luz.” Gen. 48. 3. I know that in Gen. 28. 13. he is made to say: “I am *Jehovah*, “the God of thy fathers.” But the word *Jehovah* is wanting in the best copies of Sep. and must be charged on the interpolators or correcting copyists of the Hebrew Text. For the general manner in which God announces himself to the patriarchs is, merely by calling himself the God of their fathers; as Gen. 28. 13.—or the very God of their fathers; as Gen. 46. 3.—or by denominating himself from the place of his appearance: as the God of Bethel, Gen. 30. 36. and 31. 13. and Jacob more than once denominates him by the same title. It is observable that, although the patriarch Joseph mentions the name of God about twenty times; he never once mentions him by the name Jehovah. It may be said that he abstained from mentioning that name in Egypt, either not to give offence, or because they would not have understood him; but what shall we say, when we see him using the same caution to his own brethren, after his making himself known to them? He tells them not that “*Jehovah* sent him before them, for “their preservation;” but “God,” Gen. 45. 5. and repeats the same words in the verses 7. 8. and 10.—A more remarkable instance still is in Gen. 50. 17. and 19. In the former his brothers request him to forgive their transgression against him, because they are the servants of his “father’s God:” and in the latter, he desires them not to fear: “for (says he) a reverer of “God am I.”—Surely here was the place for using the name *Jehovah*, if that name was known either to Joseph, or his brothers. Again, when in the same Ch. ver. 24. he adjures his brethren to carry his bones into the land of Chanaan; he says not: “*Jehovah* will certainly visit you—” but “God will certainly visit you;” and repeats the same words in the next verse.

The benedictions of the patriarchs tend to establish the same reasoning. “May God, the “Omnipotent, *אני אל* (says Isaac to Jacob Gen. 28. 3.) bless thee and make thee fruitful.—“May “the God, whom my fathers worshipped (says Jacob Gen. 48. 15.) the God who hath tended “me until this day, bless the lads.”—And in the most solemn benediction of Joseph, Gen. 49. 25. Jehovah is never mentioned—but “the God of Jacob”—“the God of his father”—“the Omnipotent,” *אני*.

It matters not whether these were the very words of Jacob and Isaac, or of the poetical historian who put them in their mouths. The poetical historian must have made them speak something like the language of their age, and use terms that were then known. In short, unless we

suppose the Pentateuch to be a compilation of jarring elements assemblaged by different hands, we must allow that the name *Jehovah* has been put in the mouths of the patriarchs prior to Moses, and in the mouth of God himself, by some posterior copier : for the same person who wrote the third verse of the sixth chapter of Exodus could not have been so inconsistent with himself, as to make the name Jehovah familiar to the patriarchs before that period.

Let me just add, that it is a strong presumption against the name *Jehovah* being known before Moses, that it enters not into the proper names of either persons or places ; save in the name IEVE-IRAE, already noticed : whereas we find יהו frequently in such names. The very name of *Israel* himself is of that class. But very early indeed this usage seems to have taken place. Two of Cain's sons were so denominated, *Mehujael*, and *Methusael*. Besides these, we have in the book of Genesis, *Mahalaleel*, *Ishmael*, *Kemuel*, *Bethuel*, *Magdiel*, *Jabelel*, *Jemuel*, *Malchiel*—and in a different combination, *Eldaab*, and *Eliphaz** ; whereas there is not a single person's name which has any part of *Jehovah* in it, either in its first or last syllable.—*Jochabed*, the mother of Aaron, has, indeed, been alleged as one instance to the contrary : “ Ex hoc nomine (says Simonis) colligunt falsum esse, quod quidam putant, Moses demum tempore nomen *Jehovah* revelatum fuisse, ob locum Exod. 6. 3.” Onomast. p. 517. The inference is rash, and unwarranted. For, in the first place it is not certain that all names beginning with יהו are compounded of יהו and some other word : perhaps none of them are so compounded. Clearly to entitle *Jochabed* to such an etymology, it ought to be written יהוֹכָבֵד .—But waving this ; and granting that *Jochabed* יהוֹכָבֵד is a compound of יהו and כָּבֵד , may not this name have been given her by way of honour, even after her death ? Or may she not have been still alive at the time of her son's mission to Egypt, and then received this name† ?—At any rate, this single name, whencesoever it be derived, or whensoever it were given, cannot stand as a proof that the name *Jehovah* was known priorly to Moses, against so positive a testimony as that of the passage in Exodus which gave rise to this discussion.

Ver. 9. The addition here in Sam. is supposed by Grotius, Schulze, and others to be an interpolation from Ch. 14. 12.—But why should it be an interpolation ? It is evidently referred to in that very place : “ Is not this what we told you in Egypt, saying : Let us alone ; and let us serve the Egyptians ; for it is better for us that we serve the Egyptians, &c.”—Our English translators were under the necessity of thrusting in these words in Italics to make the Text look consistent : “ For it had been better, &c.” It is true, the addition in Ch. 6. 9. is in none of the Antient Versions ; but this only proves at most that it was wanting in those Hebrew copies from which the Versions were made.

Ver. 21, 22. There are two typographical errors in these verses in Blayney's folio edition of 1769, and thence transported into Wilson's Bible : *Zitbri* for *Zicbri* in ver. 22. and for *Sitbri* in ver. 23. But in the first edition of James's translation there is only one error : namely *Zitbri* for *Sitbri* in ver. 23. The Hebrew words are זִיכְרִי and סִיבְרִי .

* I might add the proper names of places ; such as *Bethel*, *Pbaniel*.
Jochabed was probably younger than he, and might live to see the deliverance of her people by Moses and Aaron.

† Amram is said, Exod. 7. 20. to have lived 137 years.

C H A P. VII.

Ver. 1. *I APPOINT thee a God to Pharaoh.* נִתְּנָתִיךָ אֱלֹהִים לְפָרֹעַ. The meaning is "I will give thee a sort of godlike power over Pharaoh: but as thou art not eloquent, Aaron shall be thy interpreter, and speak in thy name." Had Aaron then studied the Egyptian language, or did he too employ an interpreter? That Moses must have known the Egyptian perhaps better than his mother-tongue may be inferred from his being brought up at the court of Pharaoh, and educated as the princess's son: and it may be supposed, that he understood the Hebrew but indifferently, unless it were the language spoken in the family of Ragnel, which is not at all improbable. It might indeed be, that, during a residence of upwards of two hundred years in Egypt, the language of that country had become in some degree familiar to all the Israelites; just as during the Babylonish captivity they gradually learned and used the Chaldee.—But a cloud of darkness hangs over all this, which the historian enables us not to dispel.

Ver. 5. *The Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord.* This seems to allude to Pharaoh's saying in Ch. 5. 2. "Who is the Lord? I know not the Lord," &c.

We are now come to the famous plagues of Egypt: the prelude to which, in my opinion, warns us to beware of implicit credulity, and greatly weakens the literal credibility of all that follows. The historian says ver. 10. that when "Aaron threw down his rod before Pharaoh, it became a serpent:" but adds; "The Egyptian magicians did in like manner, by their enchantments: for when they threw down every one his own rod, *the rods* became serpents."

This is certainly a strange narrative, which has greatly puzzled our reconcilers and commentators. Some pretend that it was a mere illusion on the part of the magicians, but a real miracle on the part of Moses and Aaron: but they are not agreed as to the species of illusion. The Christian Fathers generally imagined, that it was produced by the immediate operation of demons, who blinded the eyes of the bystanders, and made them see phantoms of serpents, that had no existence.—Others think that the same demons cunningly made the rods disappear, and put real serpents in their places.—Others talk of a real transformation, made by diabolic power, by applying "actives" to "passives," *applicando activa passivis*. "Potrant dæmones (says De Lyra) materiam proxime dispositam ad formam serpentis supponere proprio activo, ut sic generarentur." This fancy pleased Cajetan and Delrio.

Others, who are not willing to allow the demons to have any hand in the matter, are of opinion, that those wonders were effected by the mere use of natural means, and by the art of man. Michaëlis supposes that the rods of the magicians were not real rods, but stiff, motionless serpents, which had the appearance of rods, and which by being thrown on the ground recovered motion. This is certainly an easy mode of transformation: and I find some German scholiasts satisfied with it. But the Text is expressly against all such interpretations: and we may as well say, that the rod of Moses was not a real rod, as that the rods of the magicians were not real rods.

Hence, some have granted, that both the magicians and Moses wrought real prodigies, but prodigies of a different rank. "God," say they, "let the magicians perform a *less* miracle, to enhance the *greater* miracle of Moses." I can hardly think, that any rational critic will admit

this hypothesis; it is making God fight against himself, and play with miracles as at cross-purposes. He works a less miracle, sufficient to harden the heart of Pharaoh; and a greater, which has no effect in removing that hardness: for it is evident that Pharaoh and his courtiers considered both as prodigies not above the art of magic; although they might deem Moses the more expert magician*.

But what, then, are we to say of the matter? It would be wiser, perhaps, although not so honest, to say nothing at all; but that is not my manner: I must say what I think; let others think and speak as they please. I am clearly of opinion that neither the magicians of Pharaoh, nor the legislator of the Hebrews, changed their rods into serpents, any more than the sorceress Circe turned the companions of Ulysses into swine: but that either the Hebrew historian, whoever he was, invented the whole story; or that, if ever any such trial of magical skill took place, the deception was equal on both sides.

Ver. 13. *But the rod of Aaron devoured their rods.* This, according to some commentators, happened after the rods ceased to be serpents, and had resumed their prior form: a rod devouring rods, say they, is not at all impossible: "virtute divina fieri potuit."—But this is a pure fancy: the word *rod* is here metonymical; and evidently stands for *serpent*. "Baculus Moïsis," says Glassius, "in serpentem verè conversus, vocatur *baculus*, quia talis et antea fuit, et mox "futurus erat."

Ver. 17. *The waters, &c. shall be turned into blood.* This is the first plague: and a dreadful plague it must have been; if it ever was inflicted. The water of the Nile is celebrated for its suavity and salubrity†, both by antient writers and modern travellers. When Berenicé, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was married to Antiochus king of Syria, she had water sent, for her own drinking, all the way from the Nile; and when the soldiers of Pescennius Niger asked for wine, he replied: "Ye have the Nile, and demand wine:" *Nilum habetis, et vinum queritis!* Spartian. cap. 7. See also Senec. Quæst. Nat. l. iv. c. 2. Athenæus, l. ii. p. 45. Prosper Alp. De Medicina Ægypt. p. 16. Maillet, Lettres sur l'Égypte, P. 1. p. 16.

So delicious a beverage changed into blood must have been exceedingly ungrateful to the palates of the Egyptians indeed: and we can hardly suppose a greater calamity to fall on a delicate luxurious people.—But were the waters really converted into blood; or were they only changed into a red blood-like colour? "Impious query!" it will be replied: "doth not Scripture expressly say that they were turned into blood?" It doth so: but the same Scripture had said before, that rods had been turned into serpents; and will, by and by, tell us that "the dust of the earth became gnats:" but we certainly are not obliged to take either the one

* The Hebrew word is מוֹשֶׁה; which, according to Jablonksi, is an Egyptian word, composed of AR to be, with the aspiration χ for the article; and of TOMPT *magus*: but Scholtz plausibly objects to this derivation, on account of the final τ: and thinks the word is compounded of AR *patru* and DSHOM *power*, δυναμις; metonymically a miracle. The Coptic letter expressed by DSH has often the sound of T; ARDSHOM then with the prefix aspirate will be CHARTOM; the Hebrew מוֹשֶׁה: which, consequently signifies ὁ πατρὸς δύναμις, *patris miracula*, a wonder-worker. I am much inclined to think that this is the true etymon.—The names of those magicians who opposed Moses were Jannés and Jambri, according to St. Paul 2 Tim. 3. 8. But the Orientalists call him Sabar and Gadur; who, we are told, were converted on seeing their serpents swallowed by Aaron's serpent; and were on that account put to death by Pharaoh. See D'Herbelot or Calmet.

† Hence called by Æschylus αἰσχροῦ πρὸς. Prometh. 811.

or the other passage in a strictly literal sense. Accordingly some of our best modern critics assert, that it is not necessary to suppose that the waters were turned into real blood; but that they assumed a turbid red appearance, from the particles of red ochre with which they were impregnated*; and which commonly happens at every great exundation of the Nile. So Michaëlis, Schulze, Rosenmüller, Hezel, Dathe: who all place the miracle in this, that the Nile was thus troubled and rubified at an uncommon period: namely in the month of February; whereas the periodical feculency and rubricity of the Nile happen in July and October. “*Illud sanè miraculum fuit (says Rosenmüller) quod Nili illa rubido tempore planè insolito contigit; nempe in mense Februario, ex nostra anni ratione: Nili vero augmentum, cum quo phænomena illa conjuncta sunt, Junio demum vel Julio incipit. Simile miraculum foret, si in nostris regionibus, media æstate, flumina omnia, rivi, lacus, paludes, aquæ in vasis, &c. unius viri jussu uno die glacie obducerentur: id quod certè miraculum foret, quanquam glaciis ipsa res naturalis et solita est.*”—It certainly would be deemed a very uncommon phenomenon, to see all our rivers, and lakes, reservoirs, and cisterns, frozen over in the middle of June; yet even that would not amount to a miracle; for it might actually happen, and perhaps has happened, by an extraordinary change in the atmosphere: but if this happened “at the command of one man” as Rosenmüller expresses it, “and instantaneously at his command;” I confess I should deem it a miraculous event: but then I must have the strongest proofs possible, that such an event took place. Here, I have no proof, no motive of credibility, but the sole authority of an anonymous Hebrew writer; whom I find everywhere giving into the marvellous, generally clothing his narrative in the garb of poetical imagery, and, according to the oriental custom, ascribing physical events to supernatural causes.

It is worth remarking that the narrative is here not consistent with itself. In ver. 17. Moses is desired to say to Pharaoh: “With the rod which is in mine hand I will strike the waters that are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood:” and in the discharge of this commission, as it has been preserved in the Samaritan copy, he says no more. But in ver. 19. the injunction runs thus: “Say to thy brother Aaron: take thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the waters of Egypt, over their streams, and over their rivers, and over their lakes, and over all their cisterns; that they may become blood, and that there may be blood, throughout all the land of Egypt, in both cisterns of wood and stone.”—Yet in ver. 20. Aaron, not Moses, struck only “the waters that were in the river . . . and all the waters that were in the river were turned to blood; and the river so stunk, that the Egyptians could not drink water out of the river: for it was blood throughout all the land of Egypt.” Which then are we to believe? that the waters only that were in the river were changed to blood; or the whole mass of waters together, in whatsoever reservoir they were found? We must believe the latter, say our commentators; because so it is said in ver. 19. and consequently the Text of ver. 17. and 20. is to be extended to a wider meaning than the words seem to admit.—Be it so: but if all the water both in and out of the river was actually converted to blood by the outstretching of the rod of Aaron, where

* This state of a river is well described by Gavin Douglas, in his Prologue to the 7th Eneid:

“Rivers ran red, on spate, with water brown;

“And burnis harlis all their bankis down.”

found the magicians matter to work upon? For they, too, “did in like manner, by their enchantments.”—De Lyra gravely tells us, that water was brought to them, by the ministry of demons, from some other country, “which they can do (says he) with wonderful celerity.”—Others imagine that a certain quantity of real blood was procured by the same infernal agents, and cunningly substituted in the place of water. “Sanguis latentur allatus est a dæmone, et loco aquæ substitutus*.”—Others are of opinion, that the water was fetched by ordinary means from the land of Goshen, or from the Mediterranean sea—But no, says Rivet, “it is not at all probable that the king would patiently wait, until water for his magicians’ experiment should be brought from such a distance.” He therefore thinks, that either the water was brought to them from the pits dug by the Egyptians about the river†; or that all the waters were not instantly, but successively, changed into blood; first the river by Moses, and then all the rest, but not until after the magicians had performed their operation on a part of them. “Aquæ quidem omnes mutatae sunt in sanguinem, sed successivè (neque enim Scriptura dicit hoc simul factum, nec determinat Philo)—primò flumen spectante rege; tandem reliqua, postquam hoc tentassent magi in rivulo.”—This gradual transmutation also pleased Houbigant. “Sic intelligendum: Magos mutasse in sanguinem eas aquas, ad quas non iverant Moses et Aaron. Nimirum, enim, non poterant Moses et Aaron uno eodemque die, nec duobus vel tribus, ire ad omnes fluvijs, ad omnia stagna, ad omnes paludes, canales ligneos et lapideos; neque id jussèrat Mosi Deus. Jussèrat tantùm ut aquas in sanguinem verterent in omni terra Egypti. Neque id *omni* latius patet, quam ut demonstret, in genere, eas omnes aquas quas Moses et Aaron, quocunque irent, reperirent.” If such modes of reasoning please any reader, I am content. In this, however, I agree with Houbigant, that it is not *necessary* to suppose, with some interpreters, that it was not till after the seventh day, when the blood was reconverted into water, that the magicians changed them again into blood. “Non jam necesse est, hanc sanguinis plagam iterare, ut, postquam dies octo durarit, tum magi aquas, ad suam naturam reverteras, in sanguinem iterum easdem mutarint: neque id ulla potest auctoritate firmari.” By no authority, indeed! See the Rem. on Ver. 25.—Menochius makes Moses himself very kindly reserve for the magicians a certain quantity of unconverted water!—I wonder that no one has thought of an immediate creation of water for the purpose; or at least of a providential shower, howsoever uncommon in Egypt, or howsoever unreasonable.—The above will, I think, appear to every reader of ordinary sense, and unbiassed by religious prejudice, odd specimens of commentatorship. But what was to be done? The prodigy, with all its gross improbabilities, was to be literally supported; and the most ridiculous hypotheses were invented for that end. Not only the waters of the Nile, in all its various branches and canals, throughout the land of Egypt, but the whole from its most remote sources, with all the influent rivers, must have at once been changed into blood! For, if the upper part of the Nile had remained water, it must quickly have carried the *blood water* into the sea: so that not only one transmutation was necessary, whether it were instantaneous or successive, but a continued chain of transmutations,

* See Pole’s Synopsis.

† This is as little probable, as that water should be brought from a distant place: for the Egyptians would not think of digging pits, until they found that the water of the rivers, lakes, and cisterns, were undrinkable.

as the fresh water rolled down, during the whole duration of the plague; which, if we believe Philo, lasted seven days. This is, indeed, an inference not necessarily deducible from the Text; as we shall presently see: yet still the infection of the river must have lasted some considerable time, since the Egyptians were obliged to dig for water around the river, ver. 24.—which, however, according to the same Philo and the good St. Austin, they did in vain: “Foderunt Ægyptii, et sanguinem pro aquis invenerunt.” Aug. in Psalm 77.

Josephus, on this miracle, speaks with more caution. “By the command of God (says he) the river flowed bloody, αἱματωδὴς; and adds that it was not only of a bloody colour, αἷς, τῆς χροῖας δὲ μόνον ἢ τοιαύτης; but gave excruciating pains to those who would drink of it*.” This comes nearly to the opinion of Michaëlis, Dathe, Rosenmüller, and Hesel, whose entire note on this place I will present to my learned readers, in his own words: “Natürlicher weise ist hier nicht wirkliches blut das in thierischen körpern fließt, sondern nur die rothe farbe zu verstehen, welche das wasser auf einmal annehmen soll. Die Hebräer nennen die rothe farbe öfters geradezu blut. Daher heist der rothe wein, Gen. 49. 11. Deut. 32. 14. trauben-blut. Und Joel 3. 4. heist es, der mond solle in blut verwandelt werden; d. i. sich blutroth färben. —Das wasser des Nils wird, nach Pococks und anderer zuverlässigen reisebeschreiber bericht, alle jahre einmal, und zwar zu anfang des Junius, roth, welches von der rothen erde kommt, die aus den quellen des Nils geschwemmt wird, wenn sie sich stärker zu ergießen anfangen. Dafs, also, das wasser ein blut wurde, oder roth ward, war, an und für sich betrachtet, natürlich, und kein wunder. Gleichwohl aber wird es von Pharao und den übrigen Ægyptiern für etwas ausserordentliches angesehen. Und dies ausserordentliche and wirklich wunderbare müss darin bestanden haben, dafs sich das Nil-wasser zu einer ganz ungewöhnlichen zeit, ohne zweifel viel früher als sonst gewöhnlich, und auf ganz ausserordentliche art, recht hochroth färbte, und—welches die hauptsache war—dafs Moses (welches er, als mensch, ohne göttliche offenbarung nicht wissen konnte) diese färbung des Nil-wassers vorher sagte, und genau bestimmte wenn es geschehen sollte. Dies war wunder! dies Gottes finger! nicht menschenfache!”—According to these interpreters, the miracle consisted not in turning the waters into blood, or making them of a bloody colour, which they have once every year in the month of June, when the Nile exundates; but in producing this phenomenon at an unusual season, and its being foreseen and foretold by Moses. This is, at least, something like rational criticism. But still to me it appears to labour under great difficulties. For what other proof have we that Moses foretold, or foresaw, that the waters were, I shall not say, to be turned into blood, but into a blood-red colour at a season when that phenomenon never, or rarely, happened; than the bare word of an historian whose testimony seems to carry along with it strong marks of his credulity; and who relates his story with such concomitant circumstances, as render the whole, in my estimation, highly incredible?—With respect to the uncommon season in which the waters of the Nile are supposed to have been changed into blood, according to the Text, or deeply tinged with red ochre, according to some interpreters, I have two things to say. First, How is it known that this exundation of the Nile happened at an uncommon season? We are told indeed that the Israelites went out of Egypt in the spring of our year: and that the first Phasab, pre-

* Antiq. l. ii. c. 14. §. 1.

vously to their departure, was kept on the *tenth of Nisan*: but we are not told in what month, or on what day, the plagues were begun to be inflicted. We learn indeed from Ch. 9. 31. that the plague of hail happened at a time when "the barley was in the ear, and the flax boiling." This must have been some time in the month of February, in which, says Forskal, an eye-witness, the barley in Egypt is ripe:—"hordeum cum mense Februario maturatur." But as the barley is not here said to have been *ripe*, but only "*in the ear*;" we may suppose that the hail fell about the middle of February; which leaves an interval of nearly two months between the plague of the hail and the last plague of mortality; even if the first new-moon of April, that year, happened on the very first day of the month Nisan. But the first new-moon might have happened many days later, nay almost a whole month later; and, in that case, the *tenth of Nisan* would be far in *May*: so that an interval would be given, suppose from the 10th of February to the tenth of May; or three full months. Now, if the infliction of only two plagues took up the space of three months, may we not allow eight months at least for the infliction of the rest*? and this will bring us back to the precise time of the annual exundation of the Nile. On the whole then, the pretended change of the waters of the Nile into blood may, for aught we know, have happened at the very time of their perturbed state in the beginning of June: although perhaps in that year the exundation may have been greater, and the waters more highly tinged than usual†: which, whether miraculous or not, might alarm the superstitious people, and be by Moses artfully employed as a motive to obtain the liberation of the Israelites.

Or, secondly, allowing that this was in reality an extraordinary exundation of the Nile, out of its ordinary season, it would not thence follow that it was a miracle properly so called. An uncommon rain in Upper Egypt would produce that effect: and although such rains are rare, we find that they sometimes happen. "When we were at Fushout‡ (says Mr. Bruce) there "happened a very extraordinary phenomenon. It rained the whole night, and till about nine o'clock next morning: and the people began to be very apprehensive lest the whole town "should be destroyed. It is a perfect *prodigy* to see rain here; and the prophets|| said it portended a dissolution of government." Vol. i. p. 116.

To either of these hypotheses commentators are welcome—nay, they are welcome to make as great a miracle as they please of the phenomenon: but unless they do violence to their text, they must allow that the magicians did a miracle also; a petty miracle indeed, compared with that of Moses: but still a miracle—for

Ver. 22. *The Egyptian magicians did in like manner, by their enchantments.* I know, our commentators tell us, that it was all a trick on the part of the magicians. The rogues had got by them a little red earth, from the sources of the Nile, which they secretly thrust into a small

* No period of time is marked between the infliction of one plague and another; except with regard to the Frogs; and all that we are told there is, that seven days had passed since the infection of the river, when the Lord sent Moses to Pharaoh to announce another plague: but it is not said that this plague was immediately inflicted: nor is the interval between any two plagues directly noted.

† If a rain happened at the same time on the porphyry and marble mountains between the Nile and the Red Sea; the purple and red sand with which these mountains are covered would be washed down in great quantities, and run in torrents to the great river. See Bruce, vol. i. p. 186, 187.

‡ Between Tentyra and Thebes, about the 26th degree of latitude:

|| These prophets no doubt considered it as a miracle.

quantity of water*, in a cup or basin; and made Pharaoh and the other spectators believe it to be blood. That they believed it to be as much blood, as that produced by Moses and Aaron, is clear from the context; for "the heart of Pharaoh was still so hardened that he would not hearken to them." More consistent, then, are those interpreters who allow that the magicians turned water into blood, as well as Moses. "In some of the pools or lakes of water (say they) which Moses had not yet turned into blood; or in some of the waters out of the pits, which the people digged; (ver. 24.) they effected the like change. God, by permitting these deluded men thus far to succeed in their opposition, took occasion to render their impious folly more conspicuous; since, by permitting them to change the waters into blood, and putting it out of their power to restore them to their former soundness†, and by permitting them to produce frogs, which they were not able to remove, they only increased those plagues upon themselves and their countrymen." See Patrick's Comment. and James on the Pentateuch.—Enough of blood: let us proceed to the second plague.

C H A P. VIII.

IN some Hebrew copies this chapter begins only at ver. 5.

Ver. 1. *Frogs.* צפרדעים. There is no disagreement about the meaning of the word ‡, but its etymology is very uncertain. Lexicographers commonly derive from צפר, which in Chald. signifies the morning, and דע knowledge; because, say they, the frogs by croaking give warning that the morning is come. Poor Chanticleer! to have thy privilege usurped by a nasty frog! —But, no: frogs croak not in the morning but in the evening, and in the dark, when they come out of their watery residence to indulge their amours and coo to their mates ||.

Parkhurst takes the word to be a compound of צפר "denoting the brisk action or motion of light; and דע to feel, because these animals are in an eminent manner affected by it. They usually croak only in the summer months, and hide themselves when winter approaches. The above derivation (continues he) is not a little confirmed by two of the Chaldee names of this animal, אורדע and אורדע, plainly compounded in like manner of אור light and דע to feel." This etymon is false in several respects: for, First, a meaning is given to צפר which it has not either in Hebrew or any kindred dialect. Secondly, were it granted that צפר signifies light, and metaphorically summer, it could not form a compound with דע, in the form of צפרדע, to denote

* Others will have it, that they coloured the water with a rod dipped in some reddish matter; "baculo intinquo materiam rubricanti," says Rosenmüller.

† We read not when, or how, the waters were restored to their former soundness: and here the historian seems to have overlooked a material point. Another miracle was to have been expected to reconvert the blood into water; at least what was in the lakes and cisterns: for we may suppose that what was in the river and its branches would be carried, in the course of seven days, into the sea. What a pity it was not the Red Sea! for then we should have an excellent reason for its being so called. See Rem. on Ch. 14. 18.

‡ Aben Ezra, indeed, says that several Rabbis thought it was the crocodile; and Abernethy himself deemed this opinion very probable. The proofs which he has adduced in support of it, had so great a weight with D. Levi, that he is firmly persuaded that it is the right one. But Aben-Ezrah and Jarhi think differently: and there are few modern critics, I believe, who think not as they do.

|| "Porro, clamor vesperinus quem Græci ολοθυγονες, Latini couxationem appellanti, illis est pro incentivo et amatorio carmine; ut pluribus scribunt Ælianus et Plutarchus." Bochart, Hieroz.

the feeler of light, or as we might say, *light-feeler*. Hebrew words are not so compounded: it would be רעדעפ. Thirdly, twenty other animals feel the genial warmth of summer as much or more than the frog, and are as much afraid of the nipping cold of winter. Mr. Parkhurst's corroboration from the Chaldee is founded on misconception. The word is not מורדע nor מורדע, but מורדע, which is nothing else than the Hebrew term according to the Chaldee orthography, which frequently converts a *tzadé* into an *ain*, and a *phé* into a *vau*. It is true, the Syriac version has מורדע, and the Sam. version מורדע; but this is an usual commutation of *ain* into *aleph*: so that the word is originally still the same. The Arabic of Saadias مَرَدَع is evidently a contraction of مَرَدَع, with the insertion of *eliph* and the change of *tzadé* into *dad*.

Let us next see Bochart's derivation, which seems now to be generally received. He will have it to be compounded of the Arabic راء *a bank* and راء *slime*: so that the Hebrew מורדע, according to him, denotes *an animal residing at the slimy banks of rivers or marshes*: "ad limofas *amnum aut paludum ripas degens*."—With all due deference to the great Bochart, I will now venture my own conjecture. I think then that the word is derived from the Hebrew root מרע *pire, miffitare, ululare*, and the Arabic راء *slims, mud*: as if we were to call *the frog the slime-croaker*: surely no inappropriate appellation.—So much for etymology—Now again to the Text.

The plague of *frogs** seems to have been a natural consequence of the overflow of perturbed slimy water. It is well known that the Nile is extremely fertile of these more nauseous and troublesome than hurtful animals: and if many of them were not annually destroyed by flocks and serpents, they would multiply prodigiously. The miracle, therefore, according to our demimiraculist commentators, consisted not merely in the multiplicity of frogs: but in their covering the whole land of Egypt in one day at the command of Moses; and their being afterwards at once destroyed by the same power. Be it so: still we are told ver. 7. that "in like manner, also, did the Egyptian magicians, by their enchantments, bring up frogs upon the land of Egypt."—They could not however remove them: this was reserved for Moses.

Ver. 9. *Deal honourably with me*. מרע מרע, which in our public version is rendered "Glory over me;—" by Coverdale "Have thou the honour before me." In Cranmer's Bible, "Rejoice thou over me." In the Bishops Bible, "Glory herein because of me." By Purver, "Honour thyself above me."—All more or less from Pagninus's "*Gloriare super me*†."—Very differently.

* The plague of frogs is not peculiar to Egypt: Cassander, ab Apollonia rediens, incidit in Abderitas qui, propter "*fanarum mirumque multitudinem relicto patrio solo, sedes quærebant*." Justin. lib. xv. c. 2. See also Pliny, Hist. Nat. Hier. part i. viii. 29. But the most singular example is that recorded by Phœnias, as quoted by Eustathius (apud Bochartum, Part ii. l. c. 2.) namely, that God rained such a quantity of frogs upon Pœonia and Dardania that the roads were full of them; that they entered the houses and vessels; corrupted the waters and victuals; and were so thick upon the ground, that no one could tread on it without touching them; and that their stench was so intolerable that the inhabitants are said to have fled from the country. "Et Phœnias quidem scripsit ὕδαι τὰς Θεῶν βατραχῶς περὶ Παιονίαν καὶ Δαρδανίαν, ὡς καὶ τοσούτων ἐν πληθὺς, ὡς τὰς ὁδοὺς πληροῦσαι: ὡς δὲ πτεινοντες, καὶ συγκλείοντες τὰς οἰκίας, ὡδὲν ἦν: ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σκευῇ ἐπλήρουτο, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων ἦσαν δι' βατραχῶν συνεκομμένοι: καὶ οὐδὲ τοῖς ὕδασι ἐν χρῆσθαι, οὐδὲ τοὺς ποταμούς ἐν γῇ δεινὰ, διὰ συσσωρευμένων αὐτῶν. ἀχλὺν δὲ καὶ ὑπο τῆς τῶν τετελευτηκότων οσμῆς, ἐφυγον, φασί, τὴν χώραν." See more in Bochart, loc. cit. † And so most modern translators, Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, Dutch, and the German of Luther. Yet what sense can be annexed to such a translation, it is not easy to perceive.

most of the antients. Sep. *ταξου προς με*, "appoint to me." So Vulg. *Constituē mibi*. Onk. שאל לך נבואה.—Syr. שאל לך נבואה, *ask to thyself a time*. It is equivalent to Sep. and Vulg.—To the same purport Saadias, על אפי. It has been supposed that they all had in their copies the *hithphael* of בואר, instead of the *hithphael* of פאר: and indeed there is no doubt of the letters *phé* and *beib* having been frequently interchanged. Yet here there is no variety of lection in either the Sam. or Heb. copies; and three of the antient translators at least read as we now do, namely Pseudo-Jonathan, Perf. and Arab. Erp. The Gr. of Venice has likewise, *καλλωπισθητι εν' εμοι*. I am persuaded that פאר is the genuine reading, and that its meaning is *to act honourably, or deal fairly*. Indeed I take the Hebrew פאר and our English *fair* to be the self-same radical word; denoting *beauty, goodness, glory, &c.* So that the words פאר and פאר are equivalent to *Deal fairly, beautifully, honourably, with me*;—as we might say of one who has done an honourable action, *it was beautifully done in him*. Every language has similar catechrefes†.

Ver. 11. "In the river only shall they remain." That is, those who were yet in the river remained there: for the swarms which had over-run the land only "died away from the houses," &c. and were gathered together by the people "in heaps, so that the land stank with them," ver. 14—a plague more nauseous than even that which preceded. If Moses had acted honourably with Pharaoh, he ought to have made the frogs creep back to their watery retreats as fast as they came: for to kill them only and leave them to stink on the land was doing things but by halves: so that the whole miracle here, if miracle there were, consisted in not letting more frogs come out of the river, streams, and lakes, to annoy the Egyptians.—Howsoever,

Ver. 15. When Pharaoh saw that there was respite, *חנן*†, he still hardened "his heart;" and consequently must not have believed, that there was any thing supernatural in the preceding prodigies.—We now come to the Third plague; namely

Ver. 17. "The dust of the earth," struck by Aaron's rod, "becoming gnats, throughout all the land of Egypt."—The word which I render *gnats* is כנים, which Josephus, the Jewish Rabbis, and most modern translators render *lice*: and Bochart and Bryant have laboured hard to support this interpretation||. They ought not, however, to have so confidently appealed to the Syr. and Chald. Versions, as being in their favour: for קלמ, or קלמ, which are the words they use, are without sufficient authority translated *pediculus* in the Polyglott§ and by Buxtorf.—From Bar-Bahlul, the prince of Syrian lexicographers, we learn that the Syr. קלמ is an animalcule hurtful to the eye-brows, *animalcula palpebris inimica*¶. Nor is it to be doubted, that the Chaldee, being the same word, has the same meaning**. So Walton: "Bestiola est exigua, lœdens cutem, penetrans per nares, aures, itemque oculos. Non igitur *pediculus*, illis partibus vix, aut ne vix insensus unquam."—Philo, who must have been well acquainted with the insects of Egypt, describes it nearly in the same manner: "A very small but most troublesome animal, which hurts not only the surface of the skin, but forces its way inwardly by the

* Houbigant corrects thus: על אפי, *tu declara mibi*.

† So the Greeks, *το καλον εργον*—the Latins,

pulchrum facinus—the Italians, *una bella cosa*—the French, *une belle action*—and we, *a beautiful voice*.

‡ Sep.

αναψυξις. Vulg. *requies*. Gr. Ven. *ανακωχη*.

|| Bochart. Hieroz. p. ii. l. 4. c. 18.—Bryant's *Plagues of Egypt*.

p. 56, et seq.

§ That is by the translator of Syr. and Tharg.; for Onkelos's translator renders קלמ by *cimex*.

¶ Apud Walton.

** The Sam. קלמ belongs to the same class.

"nostrils and ears; and even insinuates itself into the pupils of the eyes, if one be not very heedful*."—Indeed the authority of the Septuagint alone is to me a stronger proof that not *lice*, but *gnats*, σκνιφες, is the genuine meaning of כנים, than that of all the rabbinical commentators together, with Josephus at their head; and with the collateral aid of both Arabs, Pers. and Gr. Ven.: although the Arabs are at best but dubious evidence† on the question.—Nor of small avail is the testimony of Jerom who, both here and in the Psalms, follows the Septuagint; and renders כנים *sciniphes*, or *cinifes*; which he would hardly have done, if his Hebrew masters, to whom he sometimes gave too much credit, had told him that the word had a different meaning.

So much for the meaning of כנים‡; now for its etymology. Some will have it to be an Egyptian word: but this I think is improbable, as in that case we should probably find σκνιφες rendered by it in the Coptic version; which however has a very different word, *leblem*. Others derive it from כן, alluding, say they, to the *steadiness* with which *lice* adhere to the human body; or to the *firm-settling* of the *gnats* or *mosquitos* on the bodies of men or animals. Others make כן the root, and quote Isaiah 51. 6. כָּמוֹ כֵּן יָמוּתוּ, which in our common English version is rendered "they shall die in like manner||;" but which, according to those interpreters, should be *like a louse*. If כן here be the singular§ of כנים, it would greatly confirm the version of Sep. in Exod.; for the ephemeral life of any species of *gnats* would be a fitter image of the transitoriness of human life, than the very uncertain duration of the life of a *louse*: besides that the figure would be less ignoble, and more congruous to the dignity of the subject.—Michaelis is rather inclined to consider the final ך in כנים as radical, and that the *jod* is an interloper; especially as the word is thrice written without it, and twice pointed כִּנִּי with a *kametz*; and is besides in ver. 17. in concord with a singular verb וַתֵּן and וַתֵּה. This last argument is cer-

* Το δὲ ζῷον, εἰ καὶ βραχυτάτων ὅμως ἀργαλειωτάτων· οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὴν εὐφάνειαν λυμάνεται, κηρύμους ἐμποιοῦν ἀγροὺς καὶ ἐλαβερωτάτους, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔντονα διαχέεται διὰ μυκτηρίων καὶ ὠτων· σίνεται δὲ καὶ κατὰς ὀφθαλμῶν εἰσπνετομένην, εἰ μὴ φυλάσσουσιν. De vita Moïsis, l. i. p. ii. p. 97. ed. Mangey.—The description given by Origen, who also resided in Egypt, is to the same purport. "Hoc animal pennis quidem suspenditur per aëra volitans, sed ita subtile est et immittum, ut oculi visum, nisi acutè cernentis, effugiat: corpus tamen cum insederit, acerrimo terebrat stimulo, ita ut quem volitantem videre quis non valeat, sentiat stimulantem." Hom. iv. in Exod. ex Interp. Rufini. tom. ii. p. 142. ed. Bened.

† The Arabic word is کنه, too general a term to restrict the meaning to *lice*; as it denotes several other animalcules of the insect kind; as the curious reader may see by turning to Golius or to Castell. Certain it is that by the Arabic translator of the Psalms, who made his version from the Greek, the same word is used to express σκνιφες: so that, on the whole, only two versions, namely Pers. and Gr. Ven. are decidedly for *lice*: the former having کنه, the latter φθειρες.

‡ Bochart's objections are well answered by Michaelis; to whose *Supplementa* I refer my reader; and also to Oedmann's excellent *Vermischte Sammlungen aus der Naturkunde zur Erklärung der Heil. Schrift.* part i. ch. 6. His book was originally written in Swedish, but translated into German by Gröning; and printed at Leipzig in 1786. A good account of it may be found in Michaelis's *New Oriental Library*, part iii. p. 20, &c.

§ And so indeed all the ancient versions. See the Rem. on that place. § "Singularem recentiorum multi faciunt, a quo plurale כִּנִּי, ut putant, ortum: quod quidem mihi suspectum esse jam supra professus sum. Sed fac verum esse, vel huic loco aptiores *culices*, quam *pediculi* erunt: hos quidem, turpe animal atque in magnifico carmine indecorum ac prope nefas nominatu, mortales quidem agnosco, sed mori non videmus, nisi vi necentur; ut vel, quam diu vivant, ignoremus; perennare et in dies augecere sentiant ii quibus hærent: at *culices* annum vivendo non superant, sed statim anni tempore emoriantur et intereant; multo melior brevitatis vitæ humanæ nec turpis imago." Michaelis *Suppl.* ad Lex. Hebr.

tainly not cogent. Such an enallage is not unfrequent, particularly in the substantive verb. It occurs in the very first ch. of Genesis, *וַיְהִי כְאֶמֶת* without any diversity of reading even in the Sam. copies.—On the whole I am inclined to believe that the *כ* of Isaiah is the singular of *כָּנַם*, and that *כָּנַם* is a blunder of the Hebrew copyists: for in the Sam. exemplars the word is uniformly written full: which, although of little authority in the eyes of Michaëlis, is of great weight in mine: as will be more fully shewn in my Dissertation on the Sam. Pentateuch.

For the rest, it is allowed that Egypt ever was, and still is, annually infested with mosquito gnats*. Therefore, say our commentators, the miracle here consisted in bringing them at an unusual time, namely in the month of February, which in Egypt is the coldest month of the year†; whereas the gnats chiefly abound at the exundation of the Nile.—But whence is it known that this happened in the month of February? I believe it happened a short time after the plague of frogs, in the month of July or August: and I have no doubt it will be found, that at that season the mosquitos are extremely abundant in Egypt.

Ver. 18. *In like manner did the magicians try, &c.* The original has *וַיִּשְׁעוּ כֵּן*, and so did they, but the verb *שָׁעָה* sometimes signifies the attempting to do a thing. Here, according to our historian, the attempt was vain: the magicians could not produce gnats; and therefore said to Pharaoh: “The finger of a God is this;” *אֶצְבַּע אֱלֹהִים הַזֶּה*. The finger of God is his power; and is used in the same sense in the New Testament, Luke 11. 20.—Still “Pharaoh hardened his heart:” and hard indeed it must have been, beyond all credibility, if he were convinced, even by this pretended declaration of his magicians, that there was any thing miraculous in all that had yet been done. I say pretended declaration; for we have no other proof that the magicians confessed their inferiority, than the bare word of an unknown Hebrew writer; whose authority may surely be questioned, as well as that of any other historian, unless we make a sacrifice of our reason to implicit faith; and believe stupendous miracles without adequate motives of credibility.—In the infliction of the remaining plagues, Moses has the whole field to himself: the magicians are mere spectators.

Ver. 21. *A swarm of beetles.* *וַיִּשְׁעוּ כֵּן*, which in our public Version is rendered “swarms of flies;” and in the margin, “a mixture of noisome beasts.” This last is borrowed from Josephus and the Bab. Thargum; and, indeed, almost all the antient versions, except the Septuagint, lean that way.—Aquila: *μαμμωνας*.—Vulg. *omne genus muscarum*.—Syr. *ערבא כלגנס*, *mixturam omnis generis*. Both Arabs: *חֶלֶם מְלוּחָשׁ*, *mixtura ferarum*. To the same purport the Thargums: Onkelos, Perf. and Gr. Ven. have only words denoting mixture, *יֵת עֲרִיבָא*, *מִשְׁתַּמְצָא*. In this meaning it was taken by the Rabbinical interpreters; who by way of improvement add, that the mixture contained all sorts of noxious animals, serpents, scorpions, &c. Delgado is contented with a mixture of vermin. Purver: a mixture of noisome creatures. Bate: a raven!

That it was one particular insect, and not a mixture of different animals, seems pretty clear even from the context: but it is not quite certain what particular insect it was. Some have

* See Herodot. l. ii. c. 95. Bellonius, l. ii. c. 35. Hasselquist. † “Quum ista insecta Aegyptios, tum olim, tum nunc, quotannis infestare soleant etiam nullo miraculo; verisimile est, illa modo aliquo insolito immissa esse, quo quisque intelligere potuit, contigisse hanc plagam jussu Dei extraordinario.” Rosenmüller in locum.

‡ It is the Hebrew word.

imagined it to be the gad-bee, *tabanus*, from the description given by Philo, who says it is called *κυνόμυα* from its *dog-like* impudence. "The imposers of names (says he), who were wise men, gave this insect an appellation from the qualities of two most impudent animals, a *dog* and a *fly*. For this species of fly attacks with fearless fury, and will not be driven away or quit its hold, until it be satiated with blood and flesh *." This is evidently a description of the gad-bee; but no proof that the *צר* of Exodus was that insect. Philo, who was ignorant of Hebrew, only gives a description of the *κυνόμυα* of the Septuagint. But there are two or three circumstances which militate against this interpretation. 1. The *צר* is said to have been sent, not upon the bestial, but upon the human kind. 2. They enter the houses. 3. The very ground is filled with them. All these circumstances are against the *gad-bee*, but perfectly suit the *beetle*. It is then highly probable that the little animal in question is the *blatta Egyptiaca*, or *Egyptian beetle*; which Forskal found frequent in the houses of Alexandria; and which, having jaws and teeth, is a most voracious creature; that not only bites the human race, but also devours cloaths, books, plants; whatever comes in its way. Hence the Psalmist 78. 7. "He sent on them beetles, *צר*, which devoured them."

As to the etymon of the Hebrew word, some derive it from the Arabic *عرب* to *consume*: but, in that case, I think, it should be written *ערב*—I would, therefore, rather derive it from *עב* *dark-coloured, black*; from which also, I believe, the Hebrew *ערב* *evening* takes its origin. For the same reason the *raven* is called *ערב*. See on the subject Oedmann's *Miscellanies*, already quoted, and Michaëlis's *Supplementa*.

Ver. 22. *In the midst of the land.* בקרב הארץ. The sentence is ambiguous. The Lord's *being in the land* may mean, either that he is in the midst of *Egypt*, to afflict its inhabitants, or in the midst of the land of *Goshen*, to favour his own people. In this latter supposition the proper rendering would be "in the midst of that land:" and in this sense it is taken by Houbigant and Rosenmüller.

Ver. 23. *And make a distinction.* The Hebrew word, *פרת*, commonly signifies *redemption*; and so it is here rendered by Onk. and Tharg. and equivalently by both Arabs, Pers. and Gr. Ven. But Sep. Syr. and Vulg. have words denoting *distinction*, *διαστολή*—*פדת*—*divisionem*: and this or some such term the context seems to require. But how can *פרת* or *פדת* be wrested into such a meaning? Houbigant finds it in the Arab. *فد*, *folus, singularis*. God made a *singularity* between his people and the Egyptians. The same origin had occurred to myself before I read Houbigant: but I cannot say, that it altogether pleases me. More ingenious is the conjecture of the author of *Commentaries and Essays*; who thinks the original reading was *פלות* from *פלח*. "The mistake," says he, "of *ד* for *ל* is easy; especially, supposing the *ל* to be a little maimed at the top; and the verb *פלח* is the only verb used to express the same thing, through the whole of this transaction, as Ch. x. 4. and xi. 7. In the very verse preceding the passage in question, we have *אחלק* *I will sever, or divide*.—So here: *I will put a division*." The greatest objection to this is, that the Samaritan copies have likewise *פדת*, with a *ד*; and it is

* *Εὐνομίᾳ* ἐκαλοῦν ὁ θεοὶ τοὺς ὀνόματ' (σοφοὶ γὰρ ἦσαν) ἐκ τῶν ἀναίδεστων ζῴων συνθετὲς τ' αὐτοῖμα, μίας καὶ κύνος ἐπιφθονοῦν γὰρ καὶ ἐπιτρέχουσιν ἀδωγας· ἂν ἀνείργῃ τις εἰς τὸ ἀηττήτον ἀντιφιλονικουσιν, ἀχρὶς ἂν ὤματος καὶ σαρκὸς κορεσθῶσιν. De Vit. Mos. t. ii. p. 161. ed. Mangey.

power, as it indeed often does. The Greek of Venice has here a singular version: *ἐπὶ χειρὶ τοῦ θronου τοῦ κυρίου, κ. τ. λ.* For כַּסּ לַיָּהּ he read כַּסּ לַיָּהּ; which makes at least a tolerable sense: but then יָהּ or יְהוָה ought to be placed after יָהּ.

With the moderns I shall be short, as almost all their various renderings are reducible to the two contained in the Text or margin of our English translation. The textual version is: "For he said, Because * the Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation." In the margin: "Because the *band of Amalek* is against the throne of the Lord; therefore, &c." The former is the more common version of modern translators; the latter of Junius, Bonfrerius, Malvenda, Le Clerc, Seltener, Purver, and, what is stranger, Dathe †. More strangely still, in my opinion, Michaëlis: "So lang hände auf dem thron Gottes liegen, wird Jehovah von geschlecht zu geschlecht krieg wider Amaleck führen:" *As long as hands shall be laid on the throne of God, will the Lord, from generation to generation, carry on a war against Amalek ‡.* He is not, however, unwilling to admit Le Clerc's conjecture; namely, that for כַּסּ we should read נָס: hence, according to him, would arise the following version: "Quia contra signum Jehovah fuit manus Amalekitarum, erit bellum, &c." But this conjecture is much older than Le Clerc, and much better applied by Castalio, whose version is: "Quia Jovæ manus signo admota est (inquit) Jovæ bellum cum Amalechitis susceptum est æternum." On which he has the following sensible annotation: "Ad verbum sic legitur: Quia manus ad signum Jovæ: bellum est Jovæ cum Amalechitis in sempiternum. Reddit autem rationem nominis aræ, quam נָס יְהוָה vocavit a נָס quod est signum, id est vexillum. Nam quod in Hebræo legitur כַּסּ mendum est, tum quia nominis ratio non redderetur, quia nomen Jovanissi non a כַּסּ deductum est, sed a נָס; tum quia כַּסּ nihil significat, quanquam volunt positum pro כָּסֶף, i. e. *solio*: sed et puncta mutant, et vocem mutilant, et etymologiam atque sensum pervertunt: neque ullum locum habent, ubi ita sit positum nisi hunc; qui cum sit controversus, testimonio esse non potest. Jam quam facile in כַּסּ degeneraverit, ex figuræ similitudine intelligi potest." This is genuine criticism; which Le Clerc, probably, had not read; otherwise he would have acknowledged his obligation to Castalio. Be that as it may, the conjecture was adopted by Houbigant, who improves upon it, and, dividing the Hebrew Text thus, כִּי יָד עַל נֹס הַמַּלְחָמָה, renders "Nam manus Domini, inquit, erit in perpetuum ad vexilla belli, contra Amalec;" *the hand of the Lord shall be at the signals of war, against Amalek.* This is plausible; but, to me, not satisfactory. Let us see if nothing better can be found.

Lobstein thought he had found a treasure in the Genovesan Sam. ms. of Kennicott's 221. which for יָהּ reads יְהוָה, which in Arab. signifies *ecce, behold*. From this reading, and the meaning given to it, he renders thus: "Behold Jehovah on the throne: the Lord will war against Amalek, &c." He thinks that a certain resemblance between the *jod* and *aleph* in the Sam. or Phenician alphabet might have given occasion to some inattentive copyist to mistake the

* Heb. *The hand upon the throne of the Lord.* † "Dixit enim: Quia manus (scil. Amalekitarum) contra thronum Jovæ sublata fuerunt, bellum contra Amalekitas perpetuum esse debet." To which he adds this Note: *Thronus Dei erat tunc apud Israelitas, quorum rex erat.* ‡ "I have rendered the common Hebrew Text," says he in a Note, "as well as I could. The meaning is, As long as there shall be a supplicant in Israel to lay hands on God's altar, &c."

one for the other. Or, perhaps, he copied from a reader who confounded כִּי אֶד with כִּי יָד.— This is possible, but it is not satisfactory; for why would the Hebrew writer here borrow an Arabic interjection, when he had a common Hebrew one at hand? Is there another example in the whole Bible where אֶד stands for יָד or דָּא? Besides, what paronomasia is here? what relation to the name of the altar?

Most singular is the version of Bate: "He said, Surely the hand with the cup of the Everlasting upon it, is war from Jehovah, &c." He took כֶּס for כּוּס, a cup: יָד על כֶּס יֵה. יד can never signify *the hand with the cup of the Everlasting upon it* *.

The Rev. Mr. Dimock would correct the Text thus: כִּי יָדַע לְכֶם יָד, *that it may be known to you*: but this ingenious emendation destroys the allusion to the preceding title, which we naturally expect here.

Let me now venture my own conjecture and distribution of the Text. With Castalio and Houbigant, then, and with one Hebrew ms. I read נָס, not כֶּס, nor even כֶּסֶּא; because I cannot possibly see what *throne* has here to do, or what tolerable sense can be made out of it.— With Houbigant I also reject יָד as the compendium of יָדוֹת, but retain the letters, as belonging to two different words. The *jod* I affix to נָס, and the *hé* I prefix to מַלְחָמָה. Then reading, at the end of the verse, וְדָר, which is the Sam. lection, I thus, with Houbigant, write and point the Text—

וַיִּמְדֹּר כִּי יָד על נָס מַלְחָמָה לִיְהוָה בְּעֶמְלֶק מִדָּר וְדָר

But I do not, with Houbigant, consider נָס as the plural of נֶס, but the same with נָס of the preceding verse, to which the allusion is evidently made. The literal version of the Text, thus corrected, will be: "Nam dixit, quod manus *erit*, sub vexillo meo, belli Domini cum " Amalek, a generatione ad generationem." The word יָד, *hand*, is here to be taken in a metaphorical sense, as in 1 Sam. 15. 12. and 2 Sam. 18. 18. denoting a *monument*, or *index*, to preserve the memory of some important transaction. This metaphor I have endeavoured to render, intelligibly, in my version †, in which the allusion to the name of the altar is clearly expressed, and this without changing a letter in the Text but one, a *capb* into a *nun*; which two letters are very easily mistaken one for another, not only in the modern Heb. alphabet, but likewise in the old Samaritan: and, indeed; the permutation is of a very antient date, since it appears to have been in the copy of Sep. ‡

* His Note is: "Heb. *band on the cup*. The hand was cut, we may suppose, on one of the stones of the altar; and if the cup was in the hand, the hand must be on the cup: and so the words describe the device exactly as it was: and this is a specimen of hieroglyphical writing." † This, I trust, will by competent judges be

deemed a more natural version than that of Houbigant, who makes *band* relate to the *Lord*, and translates נָס banners; for although there is in this version some allusion to יָדוֹת נָס, it is not so complete as when נָס is made a sing. with the affix י.—The author of *Commentaries and Essays*, who also adopts the reading נָס, thinks that a *jod* has been dropt after י, and refers this word to Moses: "Because my hand (hath been) upon the ensign of the Lord, so Jehovah will have " war, &c."—The ensign, says he, was the rod of God, which Moses bore; that sign or token of divine authority by which he led the people, &c. This interpretation appears to me not natural: but let the intelligent reader compare and choose.

‡ I have sometimes imagined that *καρροβαί* might be the original rendering of Sep.; in which case they may have read in their Heb. copy, not נָסִי, but נָסִי, with a *nun*. Perhaps some of Dr. Holmes's mss. may favour this conjecture.

C H A P. XVIII.

Ver. 1. *The Lord God.* Although I have added *the Lord* on the authority of only one ms. I am convinced it stood originally in the Text, as it is still preserved in Sep. Onk. Tharg. Perf. although without *God* after it. Vulg. Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. have *God* only.

Ib. *How he [the Lord] had brought, &c.* Most copies of Sep. render כִּי דָּרַצָא יְהוָה, as if it were a parenthesis: ἐξήγαγε γὰρ Κύριος: but the Oxford ms. has rightly ὡς ἐξήγαγε. The particle כִּי here means *quomodo*, not *quia*.

Ver. 2. *After she had been sent back.* אָחַר שְׁלֹחָהּ. Sep. μετα τῆς ἀποστολῆς αὐτῆς. Vulg. *quam remiserat*, equivalently: nor is there any reason to suspect, with Mariana and Houbigant, that he read אָחַר for אָחַר: the *re* in *remiserat* sufficiently expresses the latter word, which was read by all the ant. translators.

Ver. 6. *And it was said to Moses, Lo! thy father-in-law, &c.* The present Heb. and the Sam. printed Text have אֲנִי I before וַתֵּלֶךְ. Hence our English, with most modern translators, render the colon thus: "And he said unto Moses, I, thy father-in-law Jethro, am come unto thee." But "the great impropriety," says Kennicott, "of Jethro speaking to Moses before he met him, and of Moses going out to meet Jethro after he had been spoken to by Jethro, will convince us that the word אֲנִי, I, is corrupted, from a word very similar in sound; רָאָה, *behold*; agreeably to the Greek and Syr. versions. And though the Sam. Text is printed with the same corruption here as the Heb. almost all the Sam. mss. read רָאָה... The whole difficulty is therefore removed by rendering: *And it was told Moses, Behold thy father-in-law Jethro is come, &c.*"—To this the sticklers for אֲנִי reply, that a man says to another what is reported by his messenger; and this is true: but still the reading רָאָה is here preferable: nor does the example brought from Exod. 6. 6. in the smallest degree militate on the other side. To make the cases similar, the Text here should be: "And Jethro sent word to Moses, saying, I am, &c." I am persuaded, that if רָאָה were the reading of the Heb. Text, and אֲנִי that of Sep. Syr. and 14 Sam. mss. the latter would be reprobated by those who now defend it*.

Ver. 11. *Because they had dealt haughtily with them.* The Hebrew words are, כִּי בִדְבַר אֲשֶׁר עָלֵיהֶם, and are placed in the Text at the end of ver. 11: but what sense they can have there is not easy to perceive. They are thus literally rendered by Montanus: *Quia in re qua superbierunt contra eos*: and by our last English translators: "For in the thing wherein they dealt proudly *he was* above them †.—The ancient interpreters vary in their versions. Sep.

ἐν ἐνέμῳ

* Secker, in his ms. Notes, adopts the reading of Sep. and renders: "And one said to Moses, Behold, thy father-in-law, &c."

† Cranmer: "For in the thing whereby they dealt cruelly with them are they themselves perished."—Bish. "For in the thing whereby they dealt cruelly with them were they destroyed themselves."—Genev. "For as they have dealt proudly with them, so are they recompensed."—Bate: "Because in the thing in which they prided themselves *he was* above them."—Purver: "Because *he was* in the matter wherein these did proudly against them."—All squeezed out of the Hebrew against the grain, and presenting no tolerable consequential meaning. Nor are the versions of other modern translators more satisfactory. Castalio, indeed, gives a plausible turn to the verse:

"Nunc

ἐνεκεν τούτου, ὅτι ἐπέβητο αὐτοῖς—Vulg. *eo quod superbe egerunt contra illos*.—Conformable to these are the Syr. and Perf. versions: but Onkelos and the Thargums paraphrase thus: "Because" by the self-same judgement which they thought to have inflicted on the Israelites were themselves judged."—This idea seems to have been prevalent in the time of Philo.—Saadias seems to have understood the words in a similar sense: אר עמקבהם באלמסר אלדי אפחזנה בה—לאן עמקבהם אללה באלמסר אלדי תקוחה בה עליהם.—Consonant is Arab. Erp. *لأن عَمَقَبَهُمَ إِلَهِهَ بِالْمَسَرِّ أَلَدِي تَكْوَحُهُ بَهَ عَلَيْهِمَ*.—Gr. Ven. most literally, as usual: *ὅτι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ᾧ κηρατυσσάμετο ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*: leaving his reader to supply what word he pleased.

That something should be supplied, our critics agree: but what is it?—Le Clerc makes the gods of Egypt the nominative to *וַי*, and their pride the antecedent to *עליהם*. "Quia id, quo" "superbiebant, contra eos fuit."—Houbigant fancied that *וַי* had been dropped after *וַי*; and, making *the Egyptians* the nominative to *וַי*, renders "Quoniam *Aegyptii contra eum* se extulerant, *extulit se contra illos*."—Mr. Dimock would supply *נבר* after *וַי*; "In the thing they boasted of *be prevailed* against them."—Dathe repeats *נבר*, or *הגדיל*, *ex antecedentibus*; and renders, "Nam in eo ipso, in quo illi (*Aegyptii*) Israelitas longe superabant, magnum sese exhibuit." That is, "For in that very thing, (namely, cavalry,) in which they (i. e. the Egyptians) far surpassed *the Israelites*, he (i. e. the Lord) shewed himself great." This, I confess, appears to me a strange version. Michaëlis is of opinion that Jethro alludes to the cruelty of the Egyptians in drowning the male children of the Israelites, and renders: "Denn in eben dem element bewies er sich groß, damit sie an den Israeliten tyranney geübt hatten."—This idea he seems to have borrowed from the Thargums, in which we find the following paraphrase: ארום בפתנסה דארשעו מצרא למידן ית ישראל במי' עליהן ודד דינא לאיתרנא: במי' the meaning of which is, that as the Egyptians had wickedly made water the instrument of destroying the Hebrew children, the God of the Hebrews makes now use of the same element to avenge himself of them.—I wonder that this quaint notion should be adopted by Hezel*.—I am persuaded that Jethro never thought of any such refinement.

We have seen what shifts have been used to give the words any tolerable meaning, as they now stand; but let them be transposed to the end of ver. 10, or mentally referred thither, and all will be clear, without any supplement or alteration. See my version.—Nehemiah had evidently in view this very passage, and understood it as I do, when, in his prayer, ch. 9. ver. 9 and 10, he says: "Thou sawest the affliction of our forefathers in Egypt, and heardest their cry at the Red-sea; and shewedst signs and wonders on Pharaoh and on all his servants, and on all the people of his land: because thou knewest *that they had dealt haughtily with them*." *כי הוידד עליהם*; the very terms used here by Jethro. The *Egyptians* then are the nominative

* Nunc denique intelligo, Jovam omnium deorum esse maximum, et illis, propter eorum in vos superbiam, merito accidisse." But this is making, not giving, a meaning to the words of the Text.—Diodati: "Conscio sia cosa ch'egli *fa sopra loro in quello stesso di che essi insuperbiscono*."—Luther was content to follow the Vulgate.—Le Gros thus: "Puisqu'il a fait retomber sur ces orgueilleux *la peine de leur insolence*."

* Jethro (says he) scheint hiermit auf diejenige verordnung des Pharao zu zielen, vermöge welcher alle neugeborne Israelitische knäblein ins wasser geworfen und eräuft werden sollten, um die allzustarke vermehrung der Israeliten dadurch zu hindern. Jethro würde also sagen: Jova habe seine allmacht, gröfse und erhabenheit über alle andere götter, und zugleich auch seine weisheit dadurch bewiesen, daß er gerade dasjenige mittel (das wasser) gebraucht habe, Pharao und seine ganze armee aufzureiben, dessen sich Pharao vergeblich bedient hatte, um die vermehrung der Israeliten zu hindern.

to *dealt chauntily*; and, whether the colon be transposed or not, it must necessarily be referred to them.

Ver. 13—27. From this very remarkable passage we may learn, I think, three things.—1st. That Moses had luckily made alliance with a most sensible family, in which while he lived, he must have greatly improved his stock of Egyptian learning. 2dly. That the advice here given by Jethro, and adopted by Moses, supposes that neither Jethro nor Moses considered the latter so immediately under the direction of Heaven as not to stand in need of human counsel. 3dly. From the words, ver. 20. "Teach them his statutes and laws, and *show* them the way in which they are to walk," we may presume that Moses took the hint of giving to the Israelites fixed and determinate laws, in the name of Jehovah. Moses himself alludes to this, when, in his rehearsal of the story, Deut. 1. 9—18. he concludes thus:—"At the same time" (that is, before leaving Horeb,) "I instructed you in all that ye were to do:" that is, I gave you a general code of laws, by which ye might know how to regulate your conduct.

Ver. 23. (*God so ordaining.*) Although I have so rendered the words אֲנִי אֶלֹהִים, I am not sure that I have rightly rendered. Perhaps the Text is corrupted. The Septuagint seem to have read אֲנִי instead of אֶלֹהִים, as they render κατισχυσε σε ο θεος, *God will strengthen thee*: a meaning perfectly suitable to the context *. But, even if the present reading be genuine, the common rendering of it is, perhaps, improper; and a better version of the verse might be: "If this thou wilt do, then when God commandeth *any thing*, thou shalt be able, &c."—Equivalent to this are the versions of Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe, whose paraphrase is: "Si hoc feceris, tum Deus tibi mandata sua dare potest, tum tu eis exsequendis pareris, &c."

C H A P. XIX.

Ver. 3. *Went up to God.* עָלָה אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים. So both Texts †, with all the Ant. Versions, save Sep. which has, in all the copies, εἰς το ορος του Θεου: and I am much inclined to think that this is the genuine reading. The Tharg. of Babylon says, he went to the top of the mountain, לְרִישׁ צוּרָא. In the same verse, I prefer the reading of most Greek copies, Syr. and one Heb. ms. which have *God* instead of *the Lord*. The Compl. ed. of Sep. has both: Κυριος ο Θεος.

Ver. 9. *In a thick cloud.* בֶּעָנָן דָּחֵק. So all the copies and versions, save Sep. which have εν στυλα νεφελης. They read בעָנָן instead of בֶּעָנָן. The last part of this verse has so much the appearance of an interpolation, that I once thought of throwing it into the margin; but as it is in all the copies and versions, I was unwilling to reject it; and by the turn which I have given it in my version, the tautology, I trust, is hardly perceptible.

* The Syr. has also been quoted as corroborating this reading; because his Latin translator in the Polyglott has rendered עָנָן by *roborevit*. But this is not the only mistranslation in that Latin version. The Syr. must have read as the present Heb. and Sam. Texts, and all the other Ant. Versions; except, perhaps, the Vulg. which thus paraphrases the colon: *Si hoc feceris implebis imperium Dei, et præcepta ejus poteris sustinere*. By what rules of translating, all this could be hammered out of the present Text, it is hard to guess.

† Although the Latin translator of Sam. has wrongly *ad Dominum*.

Ver. 13. *On the ceasing of the trumpet.* בַּשָּׂדֶךְ דִּבַּח. Rendered in our common version : *When the trumpet soundeth long.* "But this version," remarks well the author of *Commentaries*, &c. "conveys not the meaning of the original, but is quite inconsistent with what is said in the former verse, and afterward . . . I suspect an error in the word בַּשָּׂדֶךְ. Three Sam. mss. have בַּשָּׂדֶךְ part. Hophal, from שָׂדַךְ, *sedari, quiescere*. So the Syr. understood it; and the LXX and Chald. are agreeable to this sense." That Sep. and Syr. considered שָׂדַךְ, or שָׂדַךְ, as a part of the verb שָׂדַךְ, there is little doubt, as the former renders ἀπαύση, and the latter שתקת : but the נִשְׁמַר of Onkelos is badly rendered by his Latin translator by *substracta*: not so by the translator of Tharg. where the same Chaldee word is properly rendered *intendetur*. Chald. then is to be classed with those interpreters who consider שָׂדַךְ, or, as 7 mss. שָׂדַךְ, as the infinitive of the verb שָׂדַךְ. But the Gr. and Syr. reading being so agreeable to sense and the context, I have no hesitation in preferring it *.

1b. *Then may they come up.* The word *they*, דָּוָה, or דָּוָה, is thought by some interpreters to denote only the chiefs of the people; namely, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders mentioned ch. 24. 1.: as if God said, "When the trumpet ceaseth, then may *these*," i. e. such and such persons, "come up."—I see no foundation for such a distinction; and suppose that, after the ceasing of the trumpet, any of the Israelites *might*, if they chose it, go up towards the mountain; for it is a permission only, and not an order.

Ver. 15. *Approach not a woman.* אַל תִּגְשׁוּ אֶל אִשָּׁה. Dr. Kennicott imagined that אִשָּׁה is here for אֵשׁ, and renders *come not near unto the fire*; meaning the fiery cloud which covered Mount-Sinai; "as the phrase," says he, "*approach not a woman*, is not at all probable."—But why is it not probable? It is well known that carnal commerce with a woman was accounted a sort of impurity, not only among the Jews, but among almost all the eastern nations; and a temporary abstinence from it was deemed a necessary part of religious duty. See Herodotus, Clio. 198. and Euterp. 61.—Nay, the same superstition was long fostered by the Christian priesthood; and abstinence from the marriage-bed is still recommended to communicants.

Ver. 22. *Let the priests, even, who approach to the Lord, sanctify themselves, &c.* No legal priesthood was yet established; who then were the priests here mentioned? In my *Explan.* Note I have said that they were probably the elders of the people, who, like the more antient patriarchs, offered sacrifices for their families and dependents. Le Clerc, and others, think that *the young men* mentioned ch. 24. 5. are the priests here designed.

Ver. 25. *And told them.* What? Doubtless all that God had ordered concerning them.—But Houbigant imagined that the words אֵת כָּל דְּבָרֵי הָאֵלֹהִים have been dropped out of the

* The ingenious Lobstein gives a singular turn to this passage, which he calls the *cross of critics*. Adopting the reading of his favourite Genovesan ms. of the Sam. Text, he reasons thus: "Convertamus שָׂדַךְ in nomen שָׂדַךְ, quod *electionem* significat Job. 18. 18. בָּלָל vero, seu ejus decurtatum בָּלָל (*jod* per aphaeresin abjecto) a radice בָּלָל derivatum, denotat quodlibet *proventus* genus, sive graminis; Lev. 14. 4. sive *arboris*; Hab. 3. 16.; sive *arboris*; Isa. 44. 19. Ergo: *ramum*, seu *baculum*; hinc metaphoricè *tribulum*, uti vox טַבַּח . . . Unde jam metonymicè *signo* pro *re signata* posito, baculi Num. 17. 2. quibus nomina tribuum inscripta sacre, pro ipsius *tribulus* venire solent. Ergo, secundum lectionem Sam. "Genovesensem hæc juxta foret interpretatio: *Secundum electionem tribulum qui sunt, illi vero ascendant in montem.*"—There are few, I believe, who will resist such metaphors and metonymies; and, if the Genovesan ms. has no greater claim to the palm (*palmam præcipere*) than such readings as this, its claim is not urgent.

Text; or that these words in ch. 20. 1. belonged originally to ch. 19. and that ch. 20. should commence with וידבר אל־הָעָם לֵאמֹר: so that the whole should run thus: "So Moses went down from the mountain unto the people, and told them all these words . . . And the Lord spoke, saying, I am, &c." His reason is, because דָּבַר is used only to express what had preceded; but this is a mistake, into which it is strange such a critic as Houbigant should fall.

C H A P. XX.

HITHERTO Moses had given to the Israelites no permanent written laws: he had guided them by occasional injunctions, said to be communicated to him by Jehovah; but the many difficulties which daily arose, and the various applications that were constantly made by so numerous a people to know the will of Heaven, produced the excellent counsel of Jethro; to the fulfilling of which the sapient lawgiver now bends his whole great mind. Nothing could be better conceived, or more dexterously executed, than the plan which he adopts to give a sanction to the precepts he was about to promulge. The highest top of Sinai, where he was supposed to have received his first mission, is pitched upon as the secret sanctuary where he is to meet the Deity, and receive from him a new code of laws, to be ever after observed by the Hebrew nation, as coming from their own peculiar God. The people, first purified by ablutions and abstinence from connubial pleasures, are forbidden under pain of death to approach the mountain; and the priests themselves, who might approach it to offer sacrifice, are inhibited from ascending to its summit. Order is added to order, and caution to precaution, for the purpose of preventing the smallest infringement of this injunction. While the people wait thus, in awe and anxious expectation, a storm of thunder and lightning ensues. This, they are told, is the voice of God; who, meanwhile, is supposed to give to Moses, in words articulate, the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments.

Such I conceive to be the whole mystery. But as my conceptions are only mine own, others are welcome to conceive of it as they please; and literally to believe that Jehovah really *spoke all those words*.

There are few grammatical difficulties in this chapter. The following are worthy of some notice.

Ver. 4. *Carved idol*. There is only one word in the original, פָּסֵל; well rendered by Jerom *sculptile*, and λαξυμια by Gr. Ven. But as it is evident that it is not the mere making or using statues or images that is here forbidden, the Septuagint render not improperly εἰδωλον, which I have added in Italic characters in my version. Nothing could be more ridiculous than the violent declamations of Protestants against the use of images in the Romish church, and the application of this precept to that use: although, on the other hand, it must be confessed, that the *use* has sometimes been turned into an *abuse* bordering on idolatry.

It may be proper here to observe, that in the division of the Decalogue, the Christian churches are not agreed. The church of England, and the whole body of Calvinists, with Josephus, make two distinct precepts of ver. 3—7.; whereas the Roman Catholics, and most Lutherans, divide with St. Austin, and make one commandment of what the former make two; but, to keep up

the number of *ten*, they split what, in the other division, is deemed the *ninth* commandment. It is of so little importance, that I wonder it ever could beget a controversy *. Yet it has not only begotten vehement controversies, but unfounded misrepresentations on the part of Protestants; who maintained that the Papists had thrown the second commandment out of the Decalogue †, because it condemned their image-worship. For the rest, the specification in ver. 4. alludes clearly to the worship of the Egyptians, who had deities in all the three elements of *air, earth, and water*.

Ver. 7. *Thou shalt not apply the name of the Lord, thy God, to a falsehood.* I have not rendered, with our common version, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord, thy God, in vain;" because I am persuaded that this is not the real meaning of לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת שֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּטוֹעַת כִּי נִלְוֶנָה. The meaning is well expressed by Syr.: *לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת שֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּטוֹעַת כִּי נִלְוֶנָה*, *Thou shalt not lyingly swear by the Lord, thy God.* To the same purport Onk. Tharg. both Arabs, and admirably Gr. Ven.: *Οὐκ αρεῖς τ' ὅρκου τοῦ ὄντος τοῦ θεοῦ σου, εἰς ψεῦδος.*—A similar and just version I find in Bishop Law's ms. Notes: "Thou shalt not use the name of the Lord, thy God, in a falsehood ‡." Comp. Deut. 5. 19. where נִשְׁוֹרָה is a *false testimony*, μαρτυρία ψευδής.

Ver. 13. The Greek copies vary in the order of this and the two next commandments. The Rom ed. has *οὐ μοχεύσεις—οὐ κλέψεις—οὐ φονεύσεις*. The Oxford ms. *οὐ μοχεύσεις—οὐ φονεύσεις—οὐ κλέψεις* §. But all the other editions, with Glasg. Ambros. Canon. and the Copt. and Ital. versions, follow the order of the Hebrew: and so all the other ant. versions, and even all the copies of Sep. in P. P. Deut. 5. 17. except the Ox. ms. which has *οὐ μοχεύσεις* first.

Ver. 17. At the end of this verse is a large addition in the Sam. copy, which, in my version, I have thrown out of the Text, as probably an interpolation; adding, in my Note, that perhaps it is the only one of any note that is to be found in the Samaritan exemplar. My principal reason for this suspicion arose from the consideration, that, at this period of the history, it was not certain that the Israelites would enter into Chanaan from the East across the Jordan, since we learn from Num. 13. that it was the intention of Moses to go up from the wilderness of Pharan across the mountains: consequently the Lord could not, before that period, be made to say, that "Mount Garizim was beyond the Jordan." But on further reflection, and after a more comprehensive view of the whole history of the Pentateuch, I am now inclined to think that the reason is not so urgent as may at first sight appear. The recorder of the precept might have in view what was to happen, not what might have happened: and the same precept being repeated in Deut. 27. 1. when the Israelites were in the plains of Moab,

* On the distribution of the Decalogue, see Vossius, tom. vi. p. 450.

† What seems to have given rise to this was, the whole commandment having, in elementary catechisms, been thus abridged: "Thou shalt have no other Gods but me, &c.:" in the same manner as the precept concerning the sabbath is frequently abridged into "Remember to keep holy the sabbath-day, &c."

‡ So Dath: *Ne enuncies nomen Jovæ, Dei tui, in mendacii asseverationem.*—Rosenmüller: *Non proferes nomen Jovæ, Dei tui, ad falsum comprobandum.*—Hezel: "Du sollt den namen des Herrn, deines Gottes, nicht zum falsum aussprechen."

§ Mark, 10. 19. and Paul in his Ep. to the Romans, 13. 9. quote them in the same order: but Matthew, 19. 18. follows the Hebrew; "which may argue," says Secker, "his Gospel to have been first written in Hebrew."

it was natural to make both orders concordant to that latter situation.—For a further illustration of this subject, I must refer to my *Dissertation on the Sam. Pentateuch*.

Ver. 18. *Now the whole people heard, &c.* The Text has וְכָל הָעָם שָׁמְעוּ. Lit. *et omnis populus videntes*: a collective singular noun, with a plural participle: and so read all the ant. versions. But the Sam. instead of שָׁמְעוּ, has שָׁמְעוּ, *audire*: which I have followed in my version. Yet I would not say that the other is not a very probable reading. The metaphor of expressing what we *hear by seeing* is not uncommon. So Sophocles in *Oedip.* col. 136. *φῶς γὰρ ὅρα, κ. τ. λ.*

Ver. 21. In no where is the superiority of the Sam. Text more apparent than here. The addition which follows this verse is wanting in the Hebrew copies and all the versions: yet Moses, in his rehearsal of this very transaction, Deut. 5. 28—31. refers to this very speech; although he repeats not the whole of it. And indeed, without it, the Text is evidently bald, and ill connected.

Ver. 22. *Ye have seen, that from the heavens I have talked with you.* From these expressions, and from Deut. 5. 22. it has been inferred, that the words of the whole Decalogue were articulately pronounced by the voice of God; and I doubt not but I shall be deemed an impious unbeliever for calling the thing in question. But I am not apt to be frightened by hard words. I am not, indeed, a great believer; but I am not impious. I sincerely believe in God, and endeavour to worship him *in spirit and in truth*: but I cannot think, that, excellent in most respects as the Decalogue is, every word of it was articulately uttered by the mouth of God. If there was any articulate voice heard on the occasion, I am persuaded it was the voice of man; speaking, perhaps, through a trumpet, during the formidable thunder and lightning which then occasionally took place. But even this is not necessarily implicable from the Text, if we strip it of its highly poetical varnish, and have ever in view the Oriental modes of phraseology, so different from ours, and so replete with metaphorical personifications*. The great point with Moses was, to make his people believe that all his laws were communicated to him by Jehovah; and in this, according to his historian, he certainly took the most effectual measures to succeed. Yet we find that his divine mission was more than once doubted by the best informed of the Israelites; and it required several new, real or pretended, miracles, to remove their doubts. But if persons who had been ear and eye witnesses to all the miracles already performed, doubted of their sufficiency to establish the divine legation of Moses, it may surely be lawful for us, who have neither seen nor heard, to question their veracity, for which we have no other vouchers but an anonymous narrative, composed we know not when nor by whom; for it can never be proved, by any solid satisfactory arguments, to be the composition of Moses. But were it allowed to be, every word of it, the composition of Moses himself, that alone would not be a sufficient reason for implicitly believing all its contents. Reason bids us appreciate the writings of a Moses as we appreciate the writings of a Livy or an Herodotus; and the same or similar motives of credibility or incredibility ought to be the measure of our belief or disbelief in the former as in the latter; for, in this respect, I see no difference between a Hebrew historian and a Greek or Roman historian.

* See a very curious little work of Hezel's, called *Orien*; or an account of it in the *Analytical Review*.

Ver. 23. *Beside me.* וְנָא, *meum.* But the word is wanting in one of Kennicott's mss. nor is it rendered by Jerom or Saadias. The Septuagint seem to have read $\alpha\lambda\lambda$, unless they supplied it here from the end of the verse: however, they did not read, or they neglected, וְנָא. Οὐ ποιᾶσθε ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς θεοὺς ἀργυροῦς, καὶ θεοὺς χρυσοῦς οὐ ποιᾶσθε ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς. There is some variety of reading in the copies; but none of them has any word for וְנָא; and indeed the Text is better without it. If it be a part of the Text, it may be rendered either *beside me*, or *in opposition to me*. But perhaps וְנָא is here the sign of the accusative case; and the meaning of the precept may be: "Thou shalt not make me a god of silver, &c." i. e. Thou shalt not represent me by any sensible image. Comp. Deut. 4. 12 and 15.

C H A P. XXI.

Ver. 6. *Before the magistrates.* Lit. *Before the gods.* But it has been already observed that the term gods $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ is often applied to great personages, judges, magistrates, &c.

Ver. 8. *That he will not betray her.* There is a various reading here of a single monosyllable, but which gives a quite contrary meaning, followed by our translators: "Who hath betrothed her to himself." All the Sam. copies and the printed Hebrew Text have the negative particle אֵל ; and so read Aq. Theod. Sym. Syr. both Arabs. Perf. Gr. Ven. and, most probably, the Septuagint *.

On the other hand, the *Keri*, with 5 or 6 Heb. mss. Onk. † and Vulg. have לִּי , *fibi*; which reading, says Dathe, seems to be preferable: "Propter ultima verba בְּנִדְרֵי בְרָה *quod fidem datam ei fallat*: igitur promiserat ei matrimonium." This inference, to me, appears unjust. Whoever reads the context with any attention must, I think, be persuaded, that the Textual is the true reading. "Lectio textualis," says Rosenmüller, "ob majoris auctoritatis testes, et ob meliorem sensum, videtur præferenda." So Houbigant, *quia ipsam non desponsavit*:— and Michaëlis: "So dafs er sie nicht für sich bestimmet."—For the rest, I render בְּנִדְרֵי בְרָה; not "because he hath dealt deceitfully with her;" but *because he despiseth her*; with Sep. and Vulg. $\text{ὅτι φείσεται ἐν αὐτῇ}$ —*si speraverit eam*. Not badly Houbigant: *cum animo erit in eam alieno*. But better Michaëlis, by a slight transposition: "Verachtet er sie, so ist er nicht berechtigt, sie unter ein fremdes volk zu verkaufen."

Ver. 13. *If he do it not premeditatedly.* וְנָא לֹא יָשָׁן . In our public version rendered, after Vulg.: "And if a man lie not in wait." But וְנָא nowhere signifies *to lie in wait*; but *to act with design*. Sep. אֵין עָלָיו : and so equivalently both Arabs, Perf. and the Sam. version †.

* De Rossi and Dathe class Sep. on the other side, on the authority of the Complutensian and Roman editions; of which the former has $\text{ἐν αὐτῷ καθομολογήσατο αὐτῇ}$, the latter $\text{ἐν αὐτῷ καθομολογήσατο}$; but they should have noticed that Ald. and Alex. have $\text{ἐν οὐ καθομολογήσατο}$; with which agree Glasg. Canon. and, I doubt not, other mss. To these add the Copt. and Italic versions: so that, on the whole, we may account it the genuine lection of Sep.

† But 13 of De Rossi's Chald. mss. read with the negative.

‡ Schultens, who was continually hunting for new meanings from the Arabic, imagined that וְנָא was to be derived from נָא , *to be rash*; metaphorically, *to have a malevolent mind*. Michaëlis likewise derives it from the same root, but in the signification of *thirsting*; as if the meaning were, *but if he thirst not*, i. e. *for blood*. I wonder Dathe could adopt this idea, whose version is: *Qui vero alterius sanguinem non sitit*. Much better Houbigant: *Quod si non ex consilio egerit*.

Ver. 16. Is rightly placed in Sep. after ver. 17. This, and the addition ^{of} of the children "of Israel," shews the great value of that most antient version; for we find the same precept so given in Deut. 24. 7. מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

1b. *Secreteth him*. הִדְעֵמֶּנּוּ בּוֹ. See the Rem. on Deut.

Ver. 18. Or his fist. בְּמַטְרָף. Sep. ~~מַטְרָף~~. Vulg. *pugus*; followed by our English and most modern translators. But Onk. Tharg. and Syr. have words that denote a *sick, rod, club*: מַטְרָף—מַטְרָף—מַטְרָף. Saad. שִׁמְדוֹ, which seems to denote *any thing that bruises*. Arab. Erp. *תרמבה*, which in Walton's Dictionary is rendered *pugnus*; but I doubt very much if it admit that meaning. Michaëlis would derive it from *מַטְרָף*, *duff*; and thinks it means a *corn-shovel*; "pala, fed ferro munita; instrumentum rusticum quod rixantibus statim ad manus erat." I rather think that it has the same meaning with Perf. כְּלִיז, which denotes *a clod of hard earth; gleba*: and this is not at all unsuitable to the Text. It may mean any thing hard compounded of *earth*, in opposition to *stone*; such as an earthen bowl, or a brick-bat. However, as the real meaning is dubious, (the word occurring but twice,) I have retained the word *fist*, chiefly on the authority of Sep. with whom it is remarkable that Gr. Ven agrees: *μῆγξος*. The versions of Aq. Theod. and Syn. are lost. In all the Sam. copies of the Text the words בְּמַטְרָף אוֹ בְּמַטְרָף are wanting.

Ver. 22. *With apologies*. בְּפִלְלִים. By Jerom rendered *quantum arbitri judicaverint*; and in our public version, "as the judges shall determine." So, equivalently, Onk. Tharg. Syr. Arab. Erp. * Perf. and Gr. Ven. But such a construction is harsh and unusual; and I am persuaded that Sep. and the Sam. translator have given the true meaning—*μὲτ' ἀξιώματος*—בְּצִלָּתָן, *deprecationibus*.

Ver. 25. *Burning for burning*. כִּמְדֵי תוֹעַת כִּמְדֵי, *adustio pro adustione*. It denotes a *brand*, or *stigma*, by hot iron, or the like.

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 3. *If he have not wherewith to restore, &c.* That this relates to theft in general, and not to the case immediately preceding, is clear from the context. The case of the housebreaker ends at *שלם*, where the point should be. So the Septuagint well understood it: *οὐκ ἔσται ἀνταποδοσκόμενος*. *Ecc. de m. x. v. l.* So also Vulg.: *bomicidium perpetravit, et ipse morietur*. *Si non habuerit, &c.* To make the words *לֹא אֵין לוֹ שְׁלֹם*, &c. apply to the housebreaking thief, our interpreters have been obliged to give to *שְׁלֹם יִשְׁלֹם* a turn which they cannot bear; namely, "the housebreaking thief would have been obliged to make full restitution; and if he had not, &c.:" than which a more forced and unnatural explication can hardly be conceived; and all this to save the credit of the Masoretic punctuation. But if, by a very common *synchysis*, the words *לֹא אֵין לוֹ שְׁלֹם* be referred to the general term *thief*, all is clear, and the Text consonant with itself.

Ver. 13. *He shall bring a proof of the tearing*. יָבִיא עַד דִּמְיֻדָּה. For so rightly Sam. †, and

* Saadiah has בְּאִמְצָתָן, according to justice.

† The present Heb. has יִבְאֵדוּ, but above 30 mss. have, better, יִבְאֵדוּ; and one has יִבֵּא on a rasure, which concurs with the Sam. reading if a *birik* be supplied.

so read Onk. Syr. both Arabs, and Perf. The Septuagint, however, seem to have read as the present Hebrew, but considered $\pi\epsilon$ as a preposition, ἀξέει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ θηρᾷ *, “he shall bring him” (that is, the owner of the beast) “to the spot where his beast had been torn :” (if *θηρ* here be not *the wild beast itself*.) Jerom likewise took $\pi\epsilon$ for a preposition, but seems to have read differently from the rest, or to have been puzzled about the meaning of his Text, as he renders *Si comestum a bestia, deferat ad eum quod occisum est, et non restituet* : translated by the Douay divines thus : “If he were eaten of a beast, let him bring unto him (the owner) that which was slain, and he shall not make restitution.” But nothing is so clear as the Sam. reading, to which even the Hebrew Text, by a different punctuation, is reducible. Remove the *athnach* from $\pi\epsilon$, and read, with two mss. and most of the antients, $\pi\epsilon$ after $\pi\epsilon$; and the Text, properly pointed, $\pi\epsilon$ וְהָיָה עַד הַיּוֹם וְלֹא יִשְׁלֹם, will give the literal version : *Et adducet id, testimonium raptus ; et non rependet*. Although I still think the Sam. reading more simple and preferable. Houbigant follows the Septuagint : “Sin autem fuerit a feris discriptum, adducet eum ad locum ubi animal jacebit ; neque reddet.”—The good sense of Luther, without the aid of the Sam. made him neglect the Masoretic punctuation, and his translation is consequently excellent : “Wird es aber zerrissen, so soll er zeugniss davon bringen, und nicht bezalen :” *Has it been torn, he shall bring testimony thereof, and shall not repay*. I wonder that Dathe and Michaëlis divided and rendered otherwise.

C H A P. XXIII.

Ver. 5. *Ye shall not withhold your assistance, but shall surely help up with him*. The words of the Text are $\pi\epsilon$ וְהָיָה עַד הַיּוֹם וְלֹא יִשְׁלֹם, which are thus barbarously rendered by Montanus : *Et cessabis a deferendo ei ; deferendo deferes cum eo*. Our English translators : “and wouldst forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.” But this is wresting the Hebrew to a sense it will not bear ; for $\pi\epsilon$ never signifies *to help* ; but, on the contrary, *to forsake*. Purver tried his skill to give a more literal meaning thus : . . . *and by forsaking dost let him alone, thou shalt be utterly forsaken with him* :—an odd method truly to explain a Text. Others have taken other methods equally fanciful, which the reader may see in Bochart and in Poolc. I shall notice only two : that of Sypkens, adopted by Dathe, and that of Michaëlis. According to the former, the meaning of the verse will be : *Quando videris oseris tui affimum succumbentem sub onere suo, et volueris eum auxilio destituere, quo minus vincla ei relaxes, relaxando relaxabis cum eo* : but how this, without much straining, can be brought out of the Hebrew, I confess myself at a loss to see. Michaëlis thus : “Siehst du den esel deines feindes unter der last erliegen, so sollst du nicht vorbey gehen, und ihn seinem herren hülflos überlassen, sondern du sollst angreifen, und ihn nicht eher, als der eigenthümer selbst verlassen.”

* So Rom. Ald. Alex. and Glasg. ; but Complut. ἀξέει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ θηρᾷ, *et adducet id ad ostium* ; which Latin version has been retained in the London Polyglott, although it corresponds not with the Greek Text. Singular is the reading of ms. Canon. ; μαρτυρᾷ (for μαρτυρᾷ) ἐπὶ τῇ θηρᾷ. This expresses the Hebrew $\pi\epsilon$ as a noun, and was probably made by some corrector from the Hebrew copy : but why did he not also correct *θηρᾷ* ?—Perhaps some of Holmes's mss. may give yet other readings.

This translation, or paraphrase, is founded on a supposed double meaning in the word *לֵךְ*: first, *to leave a thing to its lord*; and, 2dly, *to leave a thing with its lord*.

But why so much ingenuity exerted to explain a Text which is visibly corrupted, and out of which no one yet has been able to draw even a plausible meaning? The original reading of the Text was, in my opinion, certainly not *לֵךְ*, but *לֵךְ*, in all the three places:—first emendation to be made. Then, instead of *לֵךְ*, we should read *לֵךְ לֵךְ*; or, with Le Clerc, (with Houbigant's good leave,) render interrogatively: "Wilt thou omit to help him?" And in either of these ways the sense will be clear and consistent. The *beth* and *resh*, in the old Samaritan characters, resemble each other as much as the *daleth* and *resh* in the common Hebrew characters; and many instances of their having been interchanged might be pointed out. It is evident that the Septuagint must have had *לֵךְ* in their copy, and that they read the negative before *לֵךְ*, since they render *οὐ παρελασθῇ αὐτό, ἀλλὰ σπουδαίῃς αὐτό μετ' αὐτοῦ*. So likewise Jerom: *non pertransibis, sed sublevabis cum eo*. The Text, thus amended, presents no difficulty. Compare Deut. 22. 4.

Ver. 7. *For I will not acquit, &c.* *כִּי לֹא אֶצְדֵּק*. So the Hebrew Text, with all the versions, save Sep. which have *καὶ οὐ δικαιώσεις*. They must have read *אֶצְדֵּק* in the 2. Perf. and *לֹא* instead of *כִּי*. This is another presumptive proof that they translated from a ms. in Samaritan letters; for, in these, the *aleph* and *thau* are very much like one another. The present Sam. copies have *אֶצְדֵּק*, which the Latin translator renders *justificabitur*; but I doubt if the word will bear to be so translated, and suspect either that it is an error, or that it is in the imperative mood; and, in this case, it will coincide with Sep. The Sam. version has *לֹא אֶצְדֵּק*; which may be rendered, *sed, ne purum pronuntiato vitiosum*. There is here a small addition in the Greek, which was omitted to be noticed among the various readings; namely, *ἐνεκεν δωροῦ, for the sake of gifts, or bribes*. It is in all the printed editions, in the Glasg. ms. and old Ital. but is wanting in Oxf. Canon. and in the Copt. version.

Ver. 8. *The eyes of the clear-sighted.* Two mss. for *פָּקִידִים* *clear-sighted*, read *חֲכָמִים* *wise*; and this seems to have been the reading of Aq. Syr. Onk. and Vulg.; but Sep. both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven. had before them the common reading. The words, from similarity of sound, sense, and characters, were easily interchanged. To the authorities marked among the Var. Readings for the addition of *עֵינֵי*, *the eyes*, add 7 printed editions of Onk. and 21 of De Rossi's Chald. mss.

Ver. 12. I have, with Houbigant, preferred the Sam. lection as the most natural, although all the versions copy the other.

Ver. 13. *Whosoever I say to you, ye shall observe, &c.* The present Text has *וּבְכֹל*, *and in whatsoever, &c.* But better the Sam. *וְכֹל*, which was the first reading of one of De Rossi's mss. and was the reading of Syr. and Saad. and perhaps that of Sep. and Vulg. who sometimes drop the copulative for the sake of brevity, and to make the sentence more emphatical. Houbigant thinks that the original reading was *וּבְכֹל*; and this is by no means improbable. It is certainly a better reading than *וּבְכֹל*; and it was easy to mistake a *capb* for a *beth*.

Ver. 17. *The Lord, your God.* I read, with Sep. Syr. Vulg. *יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ*, instead of *יְהוָה יְהוָה*,

* So Rom.; but Ald. and Compl. have *συνεργεῖς*, and Alex. *συργεῖς*, in the same meaning.

which is in the present Hebrew. The Sam. Text has *לפני*, before the ARK of the Lord; and, if it be allowed that the precept is here given by anticipation, this is no improbable reading. Indeed, the whole tissue of ordinances here enjoined seem chiefly calculated for the people when they should be settled in the land of Chanaan.

Ver. 18. There is in this verse a grievous misprint in my version: *unleavened for leavened*: which I request the reader to correct.

Ver. 19. *Ye shall not cook a kid in the milk of its own mother.* This precept, which is again repeated ch. 34. 26. and Deut. 14. 21. has very much puzzled commentators. In both places of Exodus, it is placed immediately after the precepts concerning festivals, sacrifices, and first-fruits; but, in Deuteronomy, with precepts that forbid the eating of unclean things: yet in neither of these positions is the motive or meaning readily conceived.

Philo, with whom accord Aben-Ezrah and other learned Jews, is of opinion, that the precept was given merely to teach the Israelites to abhor every species of cruelty: *ἐπιλαβὼν δειπνῶν, τὴν τροφὴν ζῶντος ἡδυσμας γενέσθαι καὶ παρέρχοντο ἀναίμακτος.* Bochart was pleased with this interpretation.

Maimonides, who very properly seeks for the natural reasons of the Mosaical injunctions, thought that a kid boiled in its mother's milk was prohibited as a gross and unwholesome food: but this is contrary to experience, unless boiling it in milk would render it so; for it is well known that the kid is both a tender and wholesome nutriment.

Abarbanel, and others, think that the precept alludes to some superstitious rite used by the idolatrous nations in honour of their gods; and a Caraites Jew, quoted by Cudworth*, affirms, that it was customary among them to boil a kid in the milk of its mother, and with the decoction besprinkle, in a magical manner, their fields and gardens; thinking, by this means, they should make them fruitful; which opinion was adopted by J. Gregorie†, and supported by Spencer‡, by very specious arguments. These, however, have been speciously combated by Michaëlis§, whose opinion is as follows.

First, He takes it for granted that *בשל* may signify to *roast* as well as to *boil*; which is hardly disputable; and, therefore, I have in my version used a general term, *cook*.—*Secondly*, That the kid's mother is here not to be limited to the real mother of any particular kid, but denotes any goat which has kidded.—*Thirdly*, That *חלב* here means not *milk*, but *butter*.—*Fourthly*, That the precept is not to be restricted to kids, but extends not only to lambs, (which is generally granted,) but to all other not forbidden animals.—These props being erected, he builds on them his conjecture; namely, that the motive of the precept was, to endear to the Israelites the land of Chanaan, which abounded in *oil*, and make them forget their Egyptian *butter*. Moses, therefore, to prevent their having any longing desire to return to that country, enjoins them to use oil in cooking their victuals, as well as in seasoning their sacrifices.

It must be confessed that this is an ingenious hypothesis. But is it well grounded?—I think not: for, in the first place, his second, third, and partly his fourth, postulates cannot easily be granted. It is unnatural to extend the meaning of the kid's (or lamb's) mother to any

* In his Discourse on the Lord's Supper, c. 2.
Legibus Hebr. l. 2. c. 9. sect. 2.

† Notes and Observations, ch. 19. p. 92.

‡ *De Le-*

§ In his *Mosaïsches Recht*, part iv. p. 210, of the second ed. and in a memoir entitled *Commentatio de Legibus Moysi Israeliticis Palæstinam carum salutaris*, sect. 10.

other goat or ewe; there is no proof that חלב ever signifies *butter*; and, although גר includes the lamb*, to extend it to all other clean animals is too great a stretch. But, in the second place, were all this granted, the conclusion would not, in my conception, be just. There was no need, nor temptation, for the Israelites to long to return to Egypt on account of its butter, when they possessed a country that flowed with milk and honey. Among the various modes of roasting meat in the East, which the reader may see in Harmer †, I find not that either oil or butter is used: and indeed roast meat is rarely eaten by them. There is no good reason then to turn בשל from its common acceptation, nor to convert milk into butter, for the sake of establishing an hypothesis which is otherwise improbable. Were I to adopt any part of Michaëlis's theory, I would say that חלב here, as often elsewhere, denotes not milk, but fat; and that the precept forbids the use of grease in cooking victuals, since oil might be more wholesomely employed for that purpose.

On the whole, I cannot but, with Le Clerc and Dathe, greatly prefer the interpretation of Spencer, which is corroborated by the addition in the Sam. copy ‡, and in some degree by the Thargums §. For, granting that the Thargums are of no great authority, and that the Sam. addition is an interpolation, it is clear, at least, that when the Thargums were composed, and when the interpolation was made, both Jews and Samaritans were of opinion that the precept alluded to some abominable rite, which was meant to be proscribed.

I once thought, and have since found that others had so thought before me, that the words might be rendered thus: "Ye shall not cook a kid while it is on its mother's milk:" i. e. during the period necessary both for its own nutrition and the ease of its dam; for it is well known that all females, for some time after parturition, are oppressed with their milk. Accordingly we find, Exod. 22. 30. that even the firstlings that were to be offered to the Lord were ordered not to be severed from their mothers until the eighth day. Gregorie imagined that the Perfic translator favoured this interpretation; but he neither well expresses, nor properly renders, the Perfic; which is not נח נשאתי בלחם דד שדי, but נח נשאתי בלחם דד שדי, but נח נשאתי בלחם דד שדי; nor does the verb נשאתי signify to kill, but to boil, or cook. Yet still I deem the interpretation probable, because it is founded on a natural cause, and excludes typic meanings. Another natural motive might be, the revolting idea of boiling or cooking a kid in the very liquor that ought to have nourished it; and this, by some, has been thought a sufficient explanation of the precept.—Let the reader now judge for himself.

Ver. 20. *Lo, mine angel I send before you.* I follow the Sam. reading, מלאכי, which was that of Sep. and Vulg. τὸν ἀγγέλου μου—*angelum meum*. It must have also been read by Perf. who has מלאכי; but not by Onk. although his Latin translator has *angelum meum*. But who is this angel? Some will have it to be Moses himself; but whoever has compared the parallel places, ch. 14. 19; 32. 34; 33. 2, 14; and Num. 20. 16; must be satisfied that this cannot be the case. Others, with equal reason, say it was Joshua. But most Christian inter-

* The Septuagint so render it here: οὗχ ἐφ' ὧντις ἀρνὴ ἐν γαλακτί μητρὸς αὐτοῦ.

† Vol. i. p. 217, 316, 317,

‡ "For he who doth this is like a man who sacrificeth an abomination; and it is a trespass against the God of Jacob."

§ O my people! house of Israel! it is not lawful for you to boil or eat flesh and milk mixed together, lest my wrath be enkindled, and I boil your products, corn and straw, together.—There is a play upon the word בשל.

preters explain it of Jesus, the Messiah; and bring the Jew Philo as an evidence of great weight in favour of this opinion *: but I, who have read Philo with some attention, find nothing in the passage but a personification of God's wisdom or providence, in the same sense in which it is often used by the authors of the Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, the former of which hath by some been ascribed to Philo himself.

The apostle Paul has also been adduced as a guarantee for this opinion; because, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. 10. 9. he says, "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, &c." But, besides that Paul is here allegorizing, and accommodating events of the Hebrew history to the times of the Gospel, it is not certain that *Christ* is here the genuine reading. The Alexandrian ms. and the Ethiopic version have *God* instead of *Christ*. Granting even *Christ* to be the true reading, it would not follow that *him* is to be understood after *as some of them tempted*: we may as well supply God from ver. 5. At any rate, it is a poor argument to prove that the *angel* mentioned in Exod. was Jesus Christ. Nay, the meaning is clear, from ch. 33. 14. where the same that is here called God's *angel* is called his *presence*; פני יי, *My presence* shall go, &c.; i. e. *My providence* shall attend you. But the Hebrews were then too carnal and gross a people to have an adequate idea of the nature, omnipresence, and particular providence, of the Deity; and therefore their legislator was obliged to make God speak to them in a language more suited to their capacities †.—I had almost forgotten to mention, that some take the angel here to be the same with the pillar of fire, ch. 16. 19, 20. So Hezel; to which I can by no means subscribe.

Ver. 27. *I will dismay*. ירע: Sep. *εωστησω*, I will *stupify*; and so Saad. *עשת*: but Vulg. *occidam*; and so equivalently Syr. *ܐܡܪܝܬܐ*, and Arab. *Erp. ٤٢٨*. Onk. and Tharg. *עשה*, I will put in disorder: and so Perf. Gr. Ven. *επιταλσω*. Our last translators rendered *I will destroy*; but in Cranmer's Bible it is *I will trouble*: a much better version; for the context shews that the word cannot here mean to *destroy*, but to *trouble, intimidate, dismay*, so as to make them *turn their backs to the Israelites*. That Schultens was right in deriving the word from the Arabic *رعا*, *liquefacere*, is confirmed by a passage in Joshua, 2. 9. where Rahab says to the spies: "The dread of you hath fallen on us, and all the inhabitants of the land are dispirited (lit. *melt*) at your approach:" and again, ver. 21. "Every man's courage failed him;" lit. *our heart was melted*; ים לבבו. Here *terror* and *liquefaction* are joined together as in Exod. and the one place is a proper commentary on the other.

Ver. 28. *I will send hornets*. Lit. *I will send the hornet*—*תצא צרעה*; as elsewhere *תצא צרעה*, *the locust, for locusts*.—Although, in rendering *צרעה*, I have followed Sep. and most of the antient versions ‡, I doubt very much of the propriety of this translation. We no-

* His words are: Καταπερ γὰρ τινὰ ποιμήν, γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ πυρ, καὶ ὅσα ἐν τούτοις φυτὰ τε αὐ καὶ ζῷα, τὰ μὲν θνητὰ τὰ δὲ θεία, ἐπὶ δὲ οὐρανοῦ φύσιν, καὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης περιόδους, καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἀστέρων τροπὰς τε καὶ χρόνους ἐναρμόσιους, ὡς ποιμὴν ὁ Θεὸς ἀγεῖ κατὰ δίκην καὶ νόμον, προσηλασμένος τὸν ὄρθαν αὐτοῦ λόγον, πρωτεύοντι υἱόν, ὡς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἱεράς ταύτης ἀγγελίας, ὅσα τις μεγάλου βασιλεὺς ὑπαρχὸς διαδεχεται. Καὶ γὰρ εἰρηται πρὸς· Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ εἰμι, ἀποστέλλω ἀγγέλους μου, κ. τ. λ. De Agricult. vol. iii. p. 25 & 26. nov. ed.—Mang. vol. i. p. 328.

† "Credibile est, Deum hac promissione se accommodasse ingenio Israelitarum, quorum admodum tenuis erat opinio de natura, omnipresencia ac providentia divina. Vix enim sibi persuadere potuissent, Deum ipsis semper affore, nisi promississet, se per angelum eos perduciturum esse in terram promissam." Rosenmüller in loc.

‡ Sep. *צרעה*—Vulg. *crabrones*—Onk. *חרצנים*—Syr. *ܐܪܝܬܐ*—Arab. *Erp. ٤٢٨*—Gr. Ven. *τοὺς σφηκας*.

where read, in the sequel of the history, that hornets, or wasps, or any other similar insects, were sent among the Chanaanites; hence some interpreters have inferred, that it is a mere metaphorical expression. So Rosenmüller: "Sub crabronibus, *variū generis mala* intelligenda "esse videntur, quæ aptissimè per hæc insecta indicari potuerunt, quum eorum punctus dolorem efficiat, et magna eorum multitudo homines valde vexare possit."—Bochart, on the other hand, contends that the words are to be taken in their proper literal meaning; and has accumulated examples of several other peoples having been chased from their habitations by insects of different kinds*; and his opinion has been adopted by the bulk of latter commentators. It is no valid objection, say they, that it is not said afterwards that *hornets* were really sent: many things may have happened which are not recorded. True; but still it is highly improbable that, if this had really happened, and that if an army of hornets had preceded the Israelitic armies, in their attacks upon the Chanaanites, it would not have been carefully noticed by the historian, as an accomplishment of God's promise. But this is not the only objection that I have to *hornets*, either in a real or figurative meaning. How צרע can have such a signification, I cannot well conceive, as neither in Hebrew, nor in any kindred dialect, is there any apparent analogy between it and the root צר. It was this, no doubt, which made Aben-Ezrah consider צרע as some malady, which, like leprosy, affected and debilitated the human body: and, from him, Delgado corrects our public version thus: "I will send the *fretting leprosy*, &c."—The Arabic translator Saadiah understood the term in the same manner; and, perhaps, the מלח of Arab. Exp. would be better rendered *tabes* than *apis*.

I will now risk a new version, drawn, I think, from the primitive signification of צר †, which I take to be *prostration, consternation, dejection of mind*; and it is not improbable that צר a leper, and צרע leprosy, may have been so denominated from the dejection and debility which accompany that loathsome disease.—This meaning of צר is perfectly suitable to the context, "I will send *consternation* before you, &c.:" but then we must read, not צרע, but either צר or צרע. The former of these readings is authorised by some copies of Sep. ‡ and by the Arabic of Saadiah §; the latter by other copies of Sep. and by Syr. || I am inclined to think that either of these readings is preferable to that of the present text: yet there is no variety of lection in the Heb. or Sam. copies.

* Hieroz. pars i. lib. iv. c. 13.

† See Castell, or Golius, on the Arabic צר.

‡ So the Rom. edition: εκθαλεις; but Ald. Compl. Alex. and the Coptic version, have εκθαλω. The Glasg. and Canon. mss. have εκθαλει; and so Aulin seems to have read in the Old Italic. Bos (I know not on what authority) says, that the Vat. Cod. has εκθαλει. The Roman editors only say, *In aliis est εκθαλει*. Such copies, I apprehend, had been corrected on the Hebrew; among which are Glasg. and Canon. mss. Theodoret, vol. i. p. 327, nov. ed. has εφοβευσεν, which favours the Heb. text.

§ תשר. || צרע.

C H A P. XXIV.

Ver. 10. THE meaning of this verse is, certainly, not obvious. The seventy elders, who accompanied Moses to the mountain, are said to have *seen** the God of Israel; of whom, however, it is elsewhere asserted, that *no one can see him and live*. The author of *Commentaries and Essays* is inclined to suspect an error in the Text; and proposes, instead of וַיֵּרְאוּ , to read וַיִּבְטְחוּ , and then the version will be: "They saw the *sign* of the God, &c." To me this correction appears not necessary. To *see God*, in the Oriental phraseology, is to see any phenomenon which indicates his *presence, providence, or protection*. Hence, here, the Septuagint properly paraphrase: $\text{καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον, ὅν ἐστηκε ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ}$ —*they saw the place where stood the God of Israel*.—The meaning of the whole passage, when stripped of its poetical imagery, I take to be this. A select number of persons are called up by Moses, to see with their own eyes a sensible mark of the divine presence. For this purpose they are permitted to ascend the mountain, high enough to be above the clouds which surrounded its sides, and to discover a purer and brighter sky than could be seen from the plain below, and of which none but those who have been on a mountain above the clouds can have any adequate idea †. This fine, clear, *sapphire*, sky is supposed to be the pavement of God's own heavenly hall, and *seeing this* is called *seeing God*.—In like manner, the street of the New Jerusalem is said, by the poetical author of the Apocalypse, 21. 2. to be *like transparent glass*.—Mount Sinai, like Mount Parnassus, has two summits; the lower one called *Horeb*, and the higher called *Sinai*. The elders of Israel were, probably, permitted to ascend to the top of the former; but the top of the latter was a sanctuary, accessible to Moses only, and to his secretary Joshua.—What I have rendered, *equal in brightness to the heavens themselves*, is in the original $\text{כַּעֲשֵׂת הַשָּׁמַיִם בְּצִוְיָהּ}$, *like the body (or essence) of the heavens in purity*. The word צִוְיָהּ seems to express well the uncommonly fine appearance of the sky, which the elders must have seen from the top of Mount Horeb. It was not that face of the heavens which is seen through a dense atmosphere, but the very *naked body* of the heavens, in its pure native splendor.—The metaphor is bold, but beautiful.

Ver. 11. To this verse those who pointed and divided the Text have added words, which, in my apprehension, cannot belong to it; namely, $\text{וַיֹּאכְלוּ וַיִּשְׁתּוּ}$, *and they ate and drank*. The historian had just before said, that *although they had seen God, he had not laid his hand upon them*; i. e. he had not killed them ‡: and then follows, *and they ate and drank*; the meaning of

* It is somewhat remarkable that the Sam. version, instead of *they saw the God of Israel*, has *they revered* (וַיִּרְאוּ) the God of Israel; and one of Kennicott's MSS. has that reading, וַיִּרְאוּ . † The sight, indeed, is wonderful, as my own eyes have witnessed. The heavens seem to put on quite a new appearance; and if the thunder happen, at that time, to roll below, it is highly grand and majestic.

‡ The manner in which this comma is paraphrased by Sep. must, at first, seem strange: $\text{Καὶ τῶν ἐπισκεπτῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διαφωνήσαν οὐδὲ τίς}$: rendered in the Old Ital. and in the Polyglott, *Et de electis Israel non diffonuit nec unus*. But in the language of Sep. διαφωνέω means not *diffono*, but *perco, postremam vocem emittens*; so that the proper version would be, *Et electorum Israelis ne quidem unus perit; seu mortuus est*: "Of the select Israelites not one perished;" which is equivalent to the Hebrew phrase, "He laid no hand on them." See Suidas, or Biel.

which is, say interpreters, that they were so far from dying, on account of their having seen God, that they ate and drank heartily at the general sacrifice*. In so frigid a conceit I cannot acquiesce, but think that the words וַיֵּשְׂאוּ וַיִּשְׂכְּלוּ should be disjoined from ver. 11, and added to ver. 12; if it would not be still better to conclude ver. 11 with וַיֵּשְׂאוּ, and render the next verse thus: "When they had seen God, and had eaten and drunken, then the Lord said to Moses, &c.:" and I am not quite sure that this is not the most proper division †.

The natural order and meaning of the Text I take to be this: whilst the elders were seeing God on the mountain, a religious repast was preparing below; and when they and Moses came down, they all ate and drank together, as was usual at national sacrifices. When the feasting was over, the Lord again called Moses to receive new instructions.

The Samaritan Exemplar has, in ver. 11, a reading different from that of the Hebrew; וַיֵּשְׂאוּ for וַיִּשְׂכְּלוּ: and so the Sam. version, וַיִּשְׂכְּלוּ; rendered in the Polyglott *adbaferunt*. But וַיִּשְׂכְּלוּ means not to *adhere to*, but to *lay hold on*; and is never so constructed as here. Two Sam. mss. have the Heb. reading, וַיִּשְׂכְּלוּ. What induced the Septuagint to render this word by *ωφθησαν*, it is hard to say.

Ver. 14. *If any one have a matter of litigation.* The Hebraism here is curious; וְכִי יִהְיֶה דָבָר בֵּי אֲנָשִׁים; barbarously, but literally, rendered by Montanus †, "Quis dominus verborum; and by Gr. Ven. *τις κυριος λογων*. How much better Sep. *εαν ται συμβη κρισις*; and Vulg. *si quid natum fuerit questionis*; and so equivalently all the other ant. versions.—I find in Bp. Law's *MSR.* notes a very singular interpretation of the above words: "Whosoever would be a man of words, i. e. learn the letters which were taught by Moses, &c." Unde hæc?

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 4. *COTTON.* שָׂשׂ. Which our translators render *fine linen*—Sep. *βυσσων*—Jerom. *byssum*—Onk. and Tharg. כָּזָה—Syr. כְּזָה—Saad. שָׂשׂ—Erp. כְּזָה—Perf. כְּזָה—Gr. Ven. *λινον*.—That שָׂשׂ, or שָׂשׂ, means not *linen*, but *cotton*, is pretty certain; but why is it called שָׂשׂ? According to Michaëlis, because it was *six-fold*: but I doubt much if ever yarn or thread of any kind consisted of so many plies. That it was twisted, is plain from the epithet שָׂשׂ, commonly annexed to it, and which the Septuagint read here *βυσσων κεκλωσμένη*; but that it had six plaits is not at all probable. I rather think that it had its name from its colour. It is the same word which is used in Esther to denote marble, and שָׂשׂ in Syr. is *white marble*.—There is a verb in the Hebrew which seems to favour this conjecture; שָׂשׂ, *gavisus est*. It is remarkable that *albus*, in Latin, and *λευκος*, in Greek, denote joy and jocundity—*λευκον ημεραν αγειν*—*albos dies transfigere*.

Ver. 5. *Seals' skins.* The meaning of שָׂרָן is not easily ascertained. The antients vary in

* "Tantum absuit, ut mortui essent; ut, contra, convivium sacrificale hilares celebrarent." Rosenmüller in loc.

† Which is followed in the Frankfort edition of Sep. and in that of Venice, 1687; and indeed all the other editions, save Grabe's, have a full-point after *videtur*. ‡ Which he substituted for Pagninus's version, *quisquis habuerit causas*: much better than our English version—"If any man have any matters to do." I wonder such scrupulous translators did not put the Hebraism in the margin.

rendering it. Sep. took it for a colour; *δερματα ὑακινθίνα*—Aq. Sym. and Theod. *ιακινθίνα*; and so Vulg. *ianthina*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. ססנתה; by Buxtorf rendered *saxus*, but by the Latin translator of Syr. and by Walton, *caerulei*, or *subnigri coloris*. To the same purport both Arabs. *وليد دهر*, *pelles subnigræ* *. From all these authorities, and that of Josephus, Bochart contends that the comma ought to be rendered *rams' skins of a red and of a violet colour*. “An outer-covering, for the tabernacle, of azure-blue,” says Parkhurst, “was very proper to represent the sky, or azure boundary of the system.” All this is specious; yet I hardly think that the writer, if he had meant to express only a variety of colour in the *rams' skins*, would have repeated ערוה after מאדמים. It is more natural then to look for another species of animal in the word תרוה; but what animal, it is not so easy to determine. The Perfic translator took it to be a *buck-goat*, *אסתו*; and the Gr. of Venice a *panther*, *δερματα παρδαλίας*.

The Jewish interpreters are agreed as to its being some animal. Jarhi says it was a beast of many colours, which no more exists. Kimhi holds the same opinion, and thinks that it is called ססנתה in the Thargums, quasi ששננה, from its having *six* colours. Aben-Ezrah, with more judgment, thinks it was some animal of the *bovine* kind, *thick* and *fat*; “for, of the skins of such animals,” says he, “*shoes* are made †. His words are: עורות תחשים עור בהמה שדמה עב' כי תנעל לא יעשה כי אם מעור עב כעור השור' ולפי דעתי שדמה שור. This is certainly a most sensible remark; and if we knew well what the rarest shoes were made of, in the time of Ezekiel, we should be at little loss to ascertain the meaning of תרוה ‡. Most modern interpreters have taken it to be the *badger*, and among these our last English translators §; but, in the first place, the *badger* is not an inhabitant of Arabia; and there is nothing in its skin peculiarly proper either for covering a tabernacle or making shoes.—Others, moved by a certain similarity of sound, will have it to be the *beas* of the Greeks; or the Arabic *sbagaal* (vulgo *jackal*).

Hafæus, Michaëlis, and others, have laboured to prove that תרוה is the *mermaid*, or *homo marinus*; the *trichekus* of Linnæus: but the skin of this fish is not at all proper either for shoes or the covering of a tent, on account of its hardness and unpliability. I cannot, therefore, but adopt, with Faber, Dathe, and Rosenmüller, the opinion of Rau; that תרוה is the *seal*, or *sea-calf*; *vitulus marinus*; the skin of which is both strong and pliable, and was accounted by the antients as a most proper outer-covering for tents, being supposed to be thunder-proof ¶; and was also made into shoes, as Rau has clearly shewn ¶. The word תרוה, then, appears to be the same with the Arabic *درو*, written also *درو*, *crassus*, *pinguis*, *carneus*; an epithet so peculiarly applicable to the animal in question, that it is in the north of this island a vulgar proverb—“He is as fat ** as a seal.”

lb. *Selim-wood*. עץ יסוד. I have, with Jerom and Onkelos, retained the Hebrew

* So it is rendered in the Polyglott, and by Castell; but I should rather think that it meant *tanned*, *curried*, or some such term. † He alludes to Ezek. 16. 10. ‡ What has been said on the subject may be read in Bynæus, *De Calceis Hebræorum*, first printed at Dort, in 1682, and reprinted in Ugolini's Collection, vol. xxix. p. 672.

§ So Purver; but Bate, *ermine-skins*; Coverdale, *doe-skins*. ¶ See Pliny, lib. ii. c. 55. ¶ Comment. de iis quæ ex Arabia in usum tabernaculi fuerunt petita, c. 2. See C. R. on Ezek. 16. 10.

** In Erse, *seal*, or *sal*, signifies the *fat* of animals. †† In Isaiah, 41. 19. it is written שמה.

word, although there is little doubt of its being a species of white-thorn, or the *spina Egyptiaca*, which grows abundantly about Mount Sinai, but "is the tree of all countries from the northmost parts of Arabia to the extremity of Ethiopia." Bruce, vol. i. p. 93. It is by Sep. rendered *acacia*, *incorruptible*; expressing its supposed quality rather than its name. The Syr. translator took it for *ebony*, the Perfic for *box-wood*, and Gr. Ven. for the *cypress*; but both Arabs have rightly *אלסנא* *, the *sant*-wood, which is the very Egyptian name for the forest *acacia*, or *white-thorn* †.

Among the Jewish commentators the common opinion is that it was the *cedar*; but there are no cedars about Mount-Sinai! No matter for that. R. Tanchuma tells us, that Father Jacob, foreseeing that his offspring would have to erect a tabernacle in the wilderness, brought cedar-plants with him into Egypt, which grew there to be trees, and which he ordered to be felled, and carried away, when the Israelites should leave that country.—Aben-Ezrah, with his usual good sense, only says that it was a wood which grew about Mount-Sinai: and Hilkuni describes it nearly in the same manner as Jerom: "Est genus arboris nascentis in creta, spinæ albæ habens similitudinem; unde omnia ligna arcæ et tabernaculi facta sunt instrumenta, quæ appellantur *settim*: quod lignum *imputribile*, et levissimum, omnium lignorum, tam in fortitudine quam in nitore soliditatem superat et pulchritudinem." Comment. in II. tom. iii. p. 314. ed. Bened.—From the same Jerom we learn, that it was by Theodotion rendered *spina*; unnoticed by Montfaucon and Bahrdr. The versions of Aquila and Symmachus are lost.

Ver. 6. Is wanting in Sep. Vat.; but the editors observe that it is in *aliis ferme omnibus libris*. It is inserted in the London Polyglott within brackets, but in Bos without any distinction. It will, I doubt not, be found in most of Holmes's mss.

Ver. 8. *Let a sanctuary be made to me, that I may dwell among you.* Moses knew too well the nature of his nation not to give them a *tabernacle made with hands*, as the residence of their peculiar God. They had been long accustomed to see such sanctuaries in Egypt †, and had worshipped the divinities which were supposed to reside in them; for it is certain, that during the sojournment of the Israelites in Egypt they followed the rites and religion of that country, and were (many of them, at least) gross idolaters §. To wean them gradually from that idolatrous and polytheistic worship, Moses wisely indulged them with an external resemblance of it. He gave them a portable temple, an ark, an altar, sacrifices, purifications, festivals, music, dances; which played upon their imaginations and affected their senses, too gross and stupid to savour a pure, simple, genuine, religion, by which God is adored *in spirit and in truth*. Indeed the bulk of mankind, *qui stupet in titulis et imaginibus*, seem to have a natural propensity to be pleased with outward show and tinsel splendor, even in matters of religion: and it is well known how soon Christianity itself began to judaize, nay paganize, in that respect.

With regard to the Hebrew worship, I have here advanced nothing but what has been al-

* It is also written *אלסנא*, which comes nearer to the Chald. *סנא*, and the Heb. *סנא*.

† See Theod.

Hæsius *De Ligno Settim*, apud Ugolini, vol. viii. p. 352.

‡ We learn from Herodotus (Euterp. c. 4.), that

the Egyptians were the first who raised temples to their gods.

§ See Josh. 24. 14. and Ezek. 23. 3, 8, 19.

lowed by the most learned of the Christian Fathers, whose testimonies the reader may see in Spencer *. I shall content myself with a single quotation from Theodoret. After a long invective against the heathen sacrifices and superstitions, he makes to himself this objection—“ But perhaps they will dare to retort all this on the true and eternal God, because they hear of laws relative to sacrifices in the divine Scripture !”—To which he answers, that those objectors “ are ignorant of the design and scope of the legislator ; who, knowing that the Israelites, from their long residence in Egypt, had caught the depraved manners of that nation, and been taught to sacrifice to idols and dæmons, and to delight in play, dancing, and music ; lest they should be indignant at being altogether precluded from those habits, he, like a wise physician, provided for their Egyptian malady this remedy : he indulged them with sacrifices, on account of their weakness ; but ordered them to immolate what they had formerly adored, bees, sheep, goats, &c. : for if, as soon as they were delivered from the power of the Egyptians, he had given them perfect laws, they would have resisted, and, refusing the yoke, have returned to their former depravity : for if, even with all this economy, they often attempted to do so, what would they not have dared to do, if God, from the beginning, had enjoined the philosophy of the Gospel † ?”

Ver. 10. *An ark*, or rather *coffer*, *cheft*. ἄρκα. Sep. *κιβωτον* ‡. That the Egyptians, Phœnicians, and almost all the antient nations, had their sacred *arks*, or *chefts*, as well as the Hebrews, is so clearly shewn by Spencer §, that no one who has read him can entertain a doubt of it. To him, therefore, I beg leave to refer my readers, on this subject, and on all the apparatus of the tabernacle, which I have no doubt of having been borrowed from the Egyptians ; perhaps with some variation as to their forms and particular uses. The essential difference consisted in this, that Moses applied them all to the worship of one invisible God, Jehovah ; whom he makes the special God of the Israelites.—See the concluding article of this Volume.

Ver. 18. *Cberubs* ; commonly written *Cberubim*, the Hebrew plural of the word. They were creatures of mere fancy, composed of *man*, *lion*, *ox*, and *eagle* ||. Almost every nation has had its *cherubs*, *spbinxes*, *griffons*, or *dragons*, to guard its sanctuary and sacred things, and to frighten the vulgar from approaching.

* *De Legibus Hebræorum*, lib. iii. c. 1. † Ταῦτα δὲ τυχὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ περὶ τοῦ ὄντος Θεοῦ, καὶ καὶ γε ὄντος φανὰς τοιμῆσουσιν· ἐπειδὴ τῶν μὲν περὶ θύσιον ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ καίμενων ἐπαύουσι νόμων, τὸν δὲ τοῦ νομοθετοῦ παντελὺς ἀγνοοῦσι σκοπὸν· ἐν γὰρ ὅθι τῇ Αἰγυπτίᾳ κλειστον ἦσαν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ διατρήσαντα χρόνον, καὶ τὰ πονηρὰ τῶν ἐγγυχωρίων εἰσδεξαμένων ἐθῶ, καὶ θυεὶν εἰδωλοῖς καὶ δαιμόσι παρ’ ἐκείνων μεμαθηκότα, καὶ παίζειν, καὶ χορεύειν, καὶ ὀργανοῖς μουσικαῖς ἐπιτεράσθαι . . . Ἰνα τοῖσιν μὴ δυσχεραίνωσιν, ὡς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκεῖνον καμπὰν κεκαλυμμένοι . . . τοδὲ το φάρμακον ὁ πατέρας ἡμετέρας τῇ Αἰγυπτίᾳ προσενηνοχε νόσος· θυεὶν μὲν, διὰ τὴν τῶν θυόντων ἀσθένειαν ἐγγυχωρήσας, τὰ δὲ σεβόμενα παρ’ αὐτῶν ἱερῶν καλεῖσας . . . Εἰ γὰρ εὐθὺς τῆς Αἰγυπτίᾳ ἐξουσίας ἀπαλλαγῆσι τοὺς τελείους προσενηνοχε νόμους, πάντως αὐ ἀπεσιρτήσαν, καὶ τὸν χαλινὸν ἀπώσαντο πρὸς τὸν προτερον ἐταλινδρομήσαν εὐθερόν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τούτων δότω προσηνυθέντων, ἐπειραθήσαν τούτο δρᾶται πόλλakis, τί οὐκ αὐ ἐταλμῆσαν, εἰ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν αὐτοῖς εὐθὺς ἐξ ἀρχῆς φιλοσοφίαν ἐνομοθετήσεν. Theodoret, Græc. Affcct. Curatio. disput. vii. tom. iv. p. 887 and 888. nov. ed.

‡ Aq. Sym. Theod. γλωσσόκομον. Vulg. *arcam*. Onk and Tharg. *ארכא*. Syr. *ܡܬܝܒܪ*, from the Greek. Both Arabs: *ܡܬܝܒܪ*, *loculus*. Pers. *میتون*. Gr. Ven. *χρηλον*. § Lib. iii. dissert. 5. p. 380, &c. || The idea was most probably borrowed from the Egyptian *spbinx*. Comp. Ezek. i. 6—10 : and see Spencer, lib. iii. dissert. iii. c. 3. and Herder *Vom geist der Hebräischen Poesie*, part i. p. 177. who overturns the system of Michaëlis by unanswerable arguments.

Ver. 22. *There will I manifest myself to thee.* I have followed Sep. who render נִתְחַוֵּי by γαυωθησομαι. The rest vary: Aq. Sym. Th. συνταξομαι; from whom Vulg. *precipiam*; but Syr. has לָךְ אֶתְחַוֵּי, *I will meet with thee*; and so equivalently both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven.: and this rendering was followed by our last English translators, “*There will I meet with thee*.” The question is, whether the root of the word here used be נִתְחַוֵּי or תָּחַ. The Sep. certainly read in their copies נִתְחַוֵּי from תָּחַ. But besides their authority, which is great, I observe, with Houbigant, that the verb תָּחַ is not constructed with a dative, except in this and the parallel places ch. 29. 42—30. 36. and Num. 17. 4. in all which places the Septuagint have, as here, γαυωθησομαι.—Michaëlis, Dathe, and Rosenmüller, prefer the other reading, which has on its side the authority of Sam.

Ver. 29. The names of the vessels belonging to the bread-table have been given with some degree of probability, but not with certainty. I shall here give the Hebrew terms, with their corresponding ant. versions.

1. *Platters.* קֶשֶׂרִי. Sep. τρεβλα—Vulg. *acetabula*—Onk. מַנְיָסָא, *lances*; the same with the Greek *μυγδα*—Tharg. פִּילֹת; and Syr. פִּלְסָא; which seems to denote a flat plate like the scale of a balance—Sam. Verf. פֶּל, *scutellas*—Saad. קֶשֶׂרִי, from the idea of *rotundity*—Arab. عَصَا, *paropsides*—Perf. כַּסְוִי, *phialas*—Gr. Ven. τρεβλα, coinciding with Sep.—Our public version, *disbes*.—It was most probably a broad *platter*, or *charger*, of a large size, as we learn from Num. 7. 13. &c. where the silver *platters* presented by the chiefs of tribes weighed 130 shekels.

2. *Incense-pots.* כַּפֵּי. Sep. θυμιατρες—Vulg. *phialas*; and so Sam. ver. פִּלְוֹת—Onk. and Tharg. בִּיכִיָא, *arculas*—Syr. כַּפָא, from the idea of *hollowness*—Saad. קֶרֶן, *capsulas*—Arab. عَصَا, *cochlearia*—Perf. כַּסְוִי, of the same import—Gr. Ven. θυμιατρες—Our public version, *spoons*.

3. *Cups.* קֶשֶׂרִי. Sep. σπονδυα—Vulg. *thuribula*—Onk. and Tharg. retain the Heb. word—Syr. וְכֹרֶא—Both Arabs, מִדְּוֶן—Perf. נִדְוִי, *calamos*—Gr. Ven. καλαμους—Our public version, *covers* †.—I have no doubt of its being a *cup* or *chalice*; but of what size or form, it is hard to say. The first cups were probably nut-shells, called קֶשֶׂרִי from their *hardness*. See Lex. Syr. under the word קֶשֶׂרִי. See also the Arab. קֶשֶׂר; which, with other significations, has that of *cortex*, *integumentum*.

4. *Cans.* מִנְיָסָא. Sep. κυαθος—Vulg. *cyathos*—Onk. and Tharg. מִנְיָסָא, *mensuras*, *modios*—Syr. מִנְיָסָא, almost the Heb. word—Both Arabs, מִנְיָסָא †, *cochlearia*—Perf. מִנְיָסָא, translated in Pol. *obelos*; but *pocula libatoria* by Walton; who adds: “Chald. בִּסְמָא, et per “metathesin Syr. מִנְיָסָא, quâ ipsâ voce utitur Bar-Bahlul in exponendo Syr. מִנְיָסָא. Favet

* But Cov. Cran. Bish. *testify unto thee.* Genes. *declare myself unto thee*; with a marginal reading, *will appoint with thee*; which corresponds with the version of Onk. and Tharg. † The Jewish commentators, in general,

explain it to be golden *rods*, which were placed upright on each side of the table, with holes in them to receive other transverse rods or *staves*; which, passing between the two rows of loaves, by the admission of air prevented them from growing mouldy. These staves were called מִנְיָסָא, or *clean-keepers*, from נָקָא. But all this appears to be rabbinical conceit; and I would, in this case, trust more to the Greek translators of the Pentateuch than to all the rabbis together. Besides, the most ancient Jewish interpreters, Onk. and Tharg. are evidently against this interpretation.

† In Arab. Erf. the diacritic mark has been mistaken; or, perhaps, מִנְיָסָא may have the same signification with מִנְיָסָא.

"etiam seq. מִשְׁכָּן." I am rather inclined to think that the Polyglott version is right, and that the Persic translator, with the Jewish Rabbis, had in view the *flaves* or *spits* above-mentioned. The Gr. of Venice certainly so understood it, as he has *παταλους*, for *κατταλους*, and that for *πασσαλους*: but these are the only two ant. versions that favour the rabbinical interpretation. I take מִשְׁכָּן, with Onk. to be the vessel out of which the wine was poured, and the preceding כוס the cup into which it was poured. This latter I render *cup*, the former *can*; but whether they are the most proper words that can be used, I will not pretend to say*. In Num. 4. 7. the order of these two last utensils is inverted, *cans and cups*, which shews that they were both used.

1b. *For making libations.* בָּרֶךְ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. Sep. εν οἷς σπεισεις εν αυτοις—Vulg. in quibus offerenda sunt libamina; and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. and Syr. But both Arabs. with Pers. and Gr. Ven. have words that denote *covering*. The last, as being the most literal, I shall here give: οἷς καλυφθησεται εν αυτοις. Our public version has, likewise, "to cover withal †;" and Delgado, "wherewith it shall be covered;" which is the very Genevan-English version. Those who so render take בָּרֶךְ for a part of the verb בָּרַךְ, *to cover*; but what *covering* has to do here, it is not easy to conceive; whereas every preceding word bids us look for *libation*. בָּרֶךְ then is to be considered as a part of the verb בָּרַךְ, as the Septuagint, Vulg. Syr. and the more ancient Thargumists, very properly understood it ‡.

Ver. 31. *Of solid work shalt thou make it.* The word מַסָּכָה is variously rendered by the antients.—Sep. מִסְכָּה—Vulg. *ductile*; and so equivalently Onk. and Tharg.—Syr. מִסְכָּה, *molten*. But Saadiah has a word which seems well to express the meaning; namely, מִסְכָּה; rendered in Pol. *fusile*; but its true meaning is *solid*, *not hollow*, nor composed of parts. It was fused in one solid mass; well expressed by Gr. Ven. συνεχῆ. That this is the meaning, is pretty clear from what follows, that all the parts of the chandelier were to be of one piece §; מִסְכָּה. Houbigant, however, understands it otherwise, and thus renders the verse: *Facies etiam candelabrum auro mundo; ductili opere facies candelabri et scapum et brachia; ex eoque eminebunt calces, spherulæ ac flores.* His reason is, that the affix in מִסְכָּה, being feminine, cannot agree with בָּרֶךְ. But there is no necessity for this agreement; the antecedent is not בָּרֶךְ, but מִסְכָּה; and his construction of the text is harsh and uncouth.

Ver. 33. *Almond-shaped cups.* מִסְכָּה מִסְכָּה; which Sep. render more generically: κρυπτες εκτετυπωμενοι καμυσκους, *cups resembling nuts*. So Vulg. *instar nucis*. Sym. uses a still less explicit term, σκετορουμενοι; but Aquila, most literally, ξημυρδαλισμενοι; and Gr. Ven. αμυρδαλωται.—Some moderns have imagined that by מִסְכָּה is here meant the *calix* (properly so called in the language of botany), that בָּרֶךְ is the *pericarp*, and פֶּרֶךְ the *corolla*. See Michaëlis, *Supplem. ad Lex. Heb.* or Rosenmüller *in loc.*

* The version of Houbigant is, *scutellas—lances—pateras—phialas*; of Dathe, *scutellas—lances—pateras—cyathos*; of Michaëlis, *Flasche—töpfe—kassen—kannen*; and of Rosenmüller, *lances—acervas—phialas—cyathos*.

† Our more ant. versions: "to pour out with all." Coverdale: "to pour out and in." ‡ So our most learned modern translators. Houb. *quibus libatur*; Dathe, *quibus libetur*; Michaëlis, *den wein aus und ein zu schenken*. One would think he had Coverdale's version before him.

§ The comma is well rendered by the Persic translator: *Let the chandelier be of one mass.*

C H A P. XXVI.

TO what has been said in Expl. Notes I have here to add some remarks on the dimensions of the tabernacle; which, as they are not mentioned, we must guess at from the dimensions of the curtains and the boards. If the latter lay close one to another, the thing is easy, with respect to the length at least. Twenty boards, of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubit each, give 30 cubits.—The breadth is not so easily ascertained: Josephus makes it 12 feet, taking it for granted, no doubt, that the 8 boards, including the two corner ones, stood exactly in the same direction. But then this will not answer with the dimensions of the curtains. The fine cotton curtains, when joined together, consisted of a piece of 40 cubits by 28. Hence Houbigant determined the length of the tabernacle to be 40 cubits; for a piece 40 cubits long and 28 broad was just sufficient, says he, to cover its top and two sides. But he considered not that, by this economy, the back part is left entirely uncovered: nor can he provide for this omission even in the second covering of goats-hair. We must therefore necessarily restrict the length to 30 cubits; and even then the first set of curtains will want a cubit on each side to cover the tabernacle close to the ground; which want was probably intended, lest so fine a piece of embroidered work should be sullied. It might indeed have touched the ground on the back end, behind the sanctuary, unless a part of it were pendulous over the fore end. However this be, it could not, certainly, cover both sides and the back end of the tabernacle, if the tabernacle had been longer than 30 cubits. This is also confirmed by the dimensions of the second set of curtains, which were altogether 44 cubits by 30; so that they exceeded the inner curtains in length four, in breadth two, cubits. Of the former surplus, two, or perhaps the whole four, cubits were either doubled back or doubled down; i. e. they hang over the fore end of the tabernacle: and of the latter, a cubit on each side covered the space left open by the inner curtains towards the ground, to which the second curtains were probably pinned down, behind the silver bases. At the back end there was, besides, an overplus of two cubits, if the curtain-piece next to the fore end were doubled down in the middle; but if it were doubled down at the seam, there was no surplus of curtain behind the tabernacle. This, I think, is the only intelligible scheme which suits the historian's description; and is not liable, as far as I can see, to any capital objection.

"But," says Houbigant, "if the tabernacle were only 30 cubits long, the boards must have stood close together: but it is not likely that this was intended; for, in that case, the fine embroidery of the interior curtains would not have been seen at all, neither within the tabernacle nor without it."—Whatever become of the visibility of the embroidery, we must not admit absurdities. If the embroidered curtain were intended to be seen within the tabernacle, it would have been better to hang it on the boards within*, or to have only a few

* It is even a doubt with me whether this was not the case; at least there is nothing in the text that seems to prove the contrary. Nay, from the curtains of goats-hair being called an *overcoat*, we are at liberty to suppose the boards to have been placed between them and the cotton curtains which served as a tapestry to the wall of gilt wood without them.

round pillars to support it at considerable intervals; for, even in Houbigant's distribution of the boards, there must have been three-fourths of the embroidery concealed if the curtains were hung without them, as the intervals were only of half a cubit. What is still worse, the boards at the back end, exclusive of the two corner ones, must have given 12 cubits for the breadth, and 15 cubits, if the two corner ones stood in the same direction. In truth, these two corner-boards are troublesome, even when the other six are placed close together, as Houbigant is here obliged to do in order to keep to his 10 cubits of breadth; and therefore he supposes that a whole cubit of each of the two corner-boards was taken up in mortising, or projected beyond the side-board, with which it was connected. But we read of neither mortises nor projections; and we learn that the two corner-boards were joined to the boards next them, on both sides, with staples, both above and below; so that we may suppose them to have stood not at right angles with the side-boards, but at an obtuse angle of about 130 degrees, which would make the breadth of the tabernacle just 10 cubits. The very Heb. word מַצְרֵפּוֹ, ver. 23, seems to denote an angle of this sort. It comes from a root which signifies *abrader*; in Chald. *amputare*; in Arab. and Ethiopic, *comprimere, curvare, deprimer*. So we might call a *bevel* a *depressed angle*. Such, at least, is the most satisfactory idea that I can form of it.

Ver. 17. *Tenons*. Heb. מַצְרֵפּוֹ. Which lit. signifies *bands*. But the word takes a variety of metaphorical acceptations; *bundle, hinge, stem, stalk, fruit-pedicle, &c.* It is here rendered by Sep. ἀγκυλιόκους; of which the true meaning is uncertain. The old Ital. retains the Gr. word *anconifcos*. It is here supposed to denote *hinges*; "which like two hands hold one another," says Biel. He seems to have had in view our common *joint-hinges*; but that cannot be here the meaning of ἀγκυλιόκους. If we attend to the etymon, ἀγκυλιόκους being an *elbow*, ἀγκυλιόκους will be a *little elbow*; and this may metaphorically denote a hinge *properly* so called, which, like the male hinges of our great gates, rests and turns in its socket; and in a similar sense it may be taken here, with this difference only, that it did not turn, but was fixed in its socket. Certain it is that Onk. Tharg. and Syr. have words that denote *hinges*; and the Gr. Ven. has δύο θύραι. The Vulg. has *incastratura*, mortises. He seems to have thought that the boards were mortised together. But this idea is unwarrantable; for it is clear from ver. 19. that the מַצְרֵפּוֹ were to be placed on the silver bases. The Samaritan version has a word which, in my apprehension, well expresses the meaning of the original, רַבִּי, *palillus, πασσαλος*; but the κατοχῆς, *retinacula*, of Symmachus, is, I believe, the best rendering; and corresponds with our *tenons*.—The *tongue-like hinges*, מַצְרֵפּוֹ מְלִשְׁנָה, of Saadiah, are reducible to the same meaning; and perhaps the *tenons* of the boards of the tabernacle were of a tongue-like tapered shape. Michaëlis thinks they were pointed, so as to pierce the ground after having gone through the bases: but it is more probable that the bases themselves were fixed to the ground by some means or other—perhaps on a frame of wood*. The only thing that here seems to beget a real difficulty is the word מַצְרֵפּוֹ, rendered by Sep. ἀντιπικτοιας, by Jerom *quibus ta-*
bula

* Houbigant imagined that the מַצְרֵפּוֹ were two grapples, or *keep-fast*, which, projecting from the face of the boards on each side, and having their other ends fixed to the silver bases, served to keep the boards perpendicular. For if, says he, the silver bases were not thus placed, one in the inside and one on the outside, the bases being forty, and each one-half cubit long, must have reached far beyond the length of the tabernacle, which is absurd.—Absurd to be sure: but

bula alteri tabulae connectatur. The other ancient versions either retain the Heb. word, or lean to the meaning of Vulg.; which, I have already observed, is inadmissible. The Gr. of Venice seems to have understood the word properly, as he has rendered it by *σπονδυλαίς*. The tenons were all made in symmetry and harmony; that is, they were all exactly similar, of the same form and dimension. Houbigant, to justify his *grapples*, derives מַשְׁלֹבֶת from the Arab. *צל*, because this word, in *Ariceana*, signifies the *spine*, or *back-bone*, consisting of *vertebrae*: But this I believe will, to most Oriental scholars, appear a forced etymon. His derivation of the Latin word *syllaba*, from the same root, is still more ridiculous. The truth is, that the primary radical meaning of *שלב* is very uncertain: it occurs only here, and again ch. 36. 22. and 1 K. 7. 28, 29, where its signification is as indeterminate as here*.—From the sister dialects we derive not much aid. In Syr. however, *מַשְׁלֹבֶת* signifies a *bird's tail*; and we have a sort of *tenon* called a *dove-tail*. In the supposition that this is the primitive radical meaning, may not מַשְׁלֹבֶת denote tenons in the form of a tail, which comes near to the Arab. version *tongue-shaped*?—At any rate I am convinced that the tenons were all of one form, as well as the sockets of the bases; and, indeed, if these were cast in the same mould, as is most probable, a perfect similarity in the tenons was absolutely necessary, whether they were cut in the wood, or pieces of metal driven into the ends of the boards; which, for aught we know, might be the case.

Ver. 19. *Bases.* אֲדָמִים. Sep. *basus*; Vulg. *bases*: and so the other versions are rendered in the Polyglott: but I believe that the מַשְׁכָּן of Onk. and the מַשְׁכָּא of Syr. ought to be rendered *fulcra*, *bearers* or *underfettors*; a word which our English translators have employed to render כְּתֻשֶׁת. The word used by both Arabs, *كَاعِدَتَانِ*, bears the same meaning.—It is remarkable that the Sam. translator, after using the Heb. word אֲדָמִים in the first comma of the verse, in the second and third comma expresses the same word by לְבָנִים. Did he think that the *bases* resembled a *plint* or *tile*? Perhaps they really did; perhaps they were square pieces of silver fixed on a frame of wood, and pierced in the middle to take in each its tenon, so that every board entered into the sockets of two bases, and, may be, entered some space into the wood below. Josephus seems to have well understood the passage: “In each of the “boards,” says he, “were two hinges, which were driven into two bases which were made of “silver, and which had holes to receive the hinges †.”

Ver. 24. It is sufficiently clear from this verse that the two angular boards were placed in a

but this is all a mere imagination: it is no where said that the bases were each one 1-half cubit long, that is, equal to the breadth of the boards: it is not even certain if the two bases together were so long as the breadth of one board: that would depend upon the size of the tenons, and their size on the thickness of the boards, which, if we can believe Josephus, was *four inches*. A plank of this size would admit of a strong tenon indeed; at least of four square inches; and such tenons, lodged in proportionate sockets, would have a sufficient hold to keep them upright without the aid of grapples; the projection of which would, in the inside at least, have been both unseemly and inconvenient. Besides, the boards were kept together by rows of bars, which, if properly adjusted, would alone keep the boards perpendicular; and there was at least one cross beam between the Holy and Most Holy Place, which would serve to the same purpose. The tent-ropes, too, would also contribute.

* In our public version it is differently rendered in all those places. In Exod. 26. 17. *set in order*: Exod. 36. 22. *equally distant*: Kings, *the ledges*. † Δύο δ' αὐτῶν [κλινοῦν] ἕκαστην προσηλὺν σπονδυλῆς, ἐλαυνόμεναι κατὰ δύο βάσεων (αὗται δ' ἀργύραι μὲν ἦσαν) πάλιν ἑκάστην τούτων προσηλὺν, δεχομένην τὴν σπονδυλίαν. Ant. lib. iii. c. 6. n. 3. p. 132.

" number of pieces which ought to have followed it. These verses make 25 lines in one of the oldest Sam. mss. and it is remarkable that 25 is the number of the lines also at Job, 40. where the first fourteen verses are a similar dislocation. Both these large transpositions must have been made very early; and this in the Pentateuch happened before the time of the Greek version, unless that version has been altered in conformity to the Hebrew."—I have no doubt that the Septuagint version has in many places been made conformable to the Hebrew since the days of Origen, and perhaps a purely genuine copy of its primitive exemplar exists not at present. See the Rem. on ch. 30. ver. 6.

PART OF CHAP. XXX.

Ver. 1. *An altar to burn incense upon.* Another Egyptian rite, adopted by the Hebrew legislator.—"The Egyptians," says Plutarch, "burn incense to the sun thrice every day*."

Ver. 2. *Its horns.* See C. R. on ch. 27. 2.

Ver. 6. *And thou shalt place it, &c.* "The progress of error," says Kennicott, "in this place is remarkable. The great error has been noted already, which is, that the first 10 verses now here belong to ch. 26. The second error is, that here, in the 6th of these 10 verses, 6 words have been carelessly expressed twice; though the 5th of them has been (in the repetition) since omitted, except in a few mss. But the chief circumstance is, that the word *הַכִּסֵּי*, *the veil*, is changed to a word very different in sense, though consisting of the same letters (with one transposed), *הַכִּסֵּי*, *the mercy-seat* †; and yet here 4 mss. have the word rightly expressed, that is, the same as *the veil*. The words here repeated are not in the Sam. Text, nor in the Greek ‡ and Arabic § versions; and 18 || Heb. mss. confirm these authorities. It must also be observed, that by this corruption of a corruption (the whole repetition and the subsequent alteration of this one word) the Hebrew Text is now made to contradict itself as well as the *Ep. to the Hebrews*; for it places the altar of incense before (לפני *in the presence of*) the mercy-seat; and if so, it must have been in the Holy of Holies; whereas the altar of incense was attended every day, and yet the Holy of Holies was entered but once a year."—All this is very specious, and the same considerations induced Houbigant to eject the second comma as an interpolation. I am, nevertheless, inclined to think that there is not only no interpolation, but no corruption, in the passage. I believe, indeed, that a word is wanting in the present text, which however is supplied in at least eight mss.; namely, the word *אֲרֹן*, *ark*. I would also read לפני, with above 80 mss. and four of the most ant. editions ¶; although the text can do without it. The text thus arranged will give the

* Ἡμαρὰς ἑκάστης πρὸς τὴν εὐχὴν τοῦ ἡλίου. De Iu et Osiride. which can signify *mercy-seat* only in a tralatitious sense.

† That is, *the lid* or *cover* of the ark, ‡ So indeed the editions; but the Rom. editors tell us that other copies had the addition κατὰ προσώπων ἱλαστήριον, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῶν μαρτυριῶν; and Canonici's ms. has this very reading, only τοῦ μαρτυρίου for τῶν μαρτυριῶν. I doubt not but other mss. read similarly.

§ This is true with respect to the Polyglott copy; but De Rossi assures us that the ed. of Constantinople agrees with the present Hebrew.

|| De Rossi reduces them to 17, but adds 9 of his own, beside another in which the words are left un-

pointed, and marked with a note of abolition. ¶ Eleven copies of Onk. have likewise the copulative.

following literal version : *Et dabis illud ante velum quod [est] ante arcam testimonii ; et e contra operculi arcae testimonii.* There is here nothing redundant nor contradictory. The first comma directs the incense-altar to be placed before the veil ; and the second marks the precise place ; namely, directly opposite to the lid of the ark, the supposed residence of Jehovah *. Before this residence, but without the veil, the incense-altar was to be placed, between the table of the presence-bread and the chandelier †.

C H A P. XXVII.

Ver. 2. *Its horns.* קרנות. Michaëlis imagined that by *horns* here were meant no more than the corners themselves of the altar ; but this interpretation is incompatible with the context, as Dathe justly observes : “ Quod miror a viro eruditissimo, cum gravi adeo incitiae reprehensione alterius sententiae, defendi ; cum clare admodum hi [anguli] ab illis [cornubus] distinguantur *facies cornua ejus in quatuor ejus angulis* : sed hæc verba ultima omittit vir celeb. in versione sua. . . . Equidem non assentiar iis, qui *cornuum* figuras in arae angulis extitisse putant, cujus sententiae argumenta non satis firma allata videntur : nec tamen קרנות cum פנות prorsus synonyma esse arbitror, sed in quatuor angulis quatuor eminentias extitisse.”—They were evidently *projections* from the four corners ; but whether upright, oblique, or curved, we learn not from the Text. I am inclined, however, to think, with Spencer, Le Clerc, Witfius, and others, that they were really horn-shaped, like those of the *ara pacis* of the Romans. Josephus expressly says so of the altar of his time : τετραγωνος δ' ἱδρυτο, κερατοειδεις προεσχεμον γωνιας ‡.

Ver. 3. *Its pans, &c.* All the copies of Sep. here strangely deviate from both the Heb. and Sam. texts. The same number of utensils are mentioned ; but how to reconcile שפאנר with מרת §, καλυπτῆρας with נר, or φιάλας with מררת, I can see no device. I have given to the Heb. terms the best explication I could ; but I will not assure that they are the best. Some think that נר is a *spovel*, and מרת a *chaffing-dish*. Dathe's version is : *Olla ejus, ad cinerem accipiendum, pala, patera, fuscinae, et batilla, omnia ejus vasa aenea sunt.* That of Michaëlis : “ Aschentöpfe, schaufeln, schalen, gabeln, kohlpfannen, und alle seine geräthschaft “ aus kupfer machen lassen.”

Ver. 5. *And thou shalt place it.* What is the antecedent to it ? According to the present Heb. text it is רשת, *lattice-work* ; according to Sam. it is מברר, *the grate* : but Sep. and Vulg. seem to have read neither רשת nor מברר, but רשת, or רשת, as they render in the plural וְשֵׁתֶיךָ אוֹתָם—*quos pones* ; making פנות, *rings*, the antecedent : and, what is very remarkable, so Gr. Ven. : yet there is no ms. that so reads. In one Heb. ms. רשת is wanting.

* The whole verse is well rendered by Gr. Ven. : Καὶ δώσεις αὐτὸ ἐναντίον τῆς αὐλαίας, τῆς ἐπὶ τῆς ἑξέλου τῆς μαρτυρίας. ANTIKPT τῆς σκεπῆς τοῦ ἐπὶ [ἑξέλου] τῆς μαρτυρίας. He read וְעַל without the copulative, and read not רשת before the last וְעַל : but he understood his Text.

† The version of Dathe is clear and elegant : *Hanc aram collocabis ante sparium quod arcam legis tegit* [better perhaps *prætegit*], *e regione operculi quod super illa arca est, unde tibi responsa dabo.*

‡ De Bell. Jud. lib. v. c. 5. n. 6. p. 324, ed. Havercamp. wrongly quoted by Spencer, lib. vi. § Perhaps for רשת they read נר in their copy. They have nothing for וְעַל.

Ib. *The altar-band.* מַרְבֵּב; by Sep. rendered מַרְבֵּב מִן הַמִּזְבֵּחַ. They seem to have read מַרְבֵּב, or mistook for it מַרְבֵּב, which may be the original true reading. It is well rendered by Syr.: מַרְבֵּב, *margins*. It evidently denotes the lower margin of the altar-band, which closed with the feet of the altar.

Ib. *So that the lattice may be at the middle of the altar.* Michaëlis supposes that the altar was formed in the shape of a capital H, and that the lower half was of grate-work round about, but that the upper half was occasionally filled with earth, on which the victim was burned. I should rather think that the form of the altar was this: its four legs, or angle-posts, were three cubits high, and as much more as served to make what are called its *horns*, which might be nothing more than the heads of the posts tapered off to a point in the shape of a horn. These angle-posts were, at half-way down from the root of the horns, surrounded with a frame or band $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubit broad; at the lower rim of which was fixed the lattice-work, or grate, on which the faggots of wood, and then the victims, were laid.

Ver. 7. *Thou shalt put.* I follow the reading of Sam. וְהָבֵאתָ, which was that of Sep. Vulg. Syr. and both Arabs. The present Heb. reading is וְהָבֵאתָ; by Pagninus rendered *adducentur*; and, after him, by most modern translators; and, among others, by our own: "And the slaves shall be put into the rings." But Luther and Castalio, who often paid a due regard to Sep. and Vulg. followed them here: "Und solt die stangen in die ringe thun:" *Quos per angulos immittes*. So Houbigant: *Vestes in annulos immittes*. In truth, the present reading, וְהָבֵאתָ אֶת בְּרִי is a vile solecism. To make grammar, it ought to be וְהָבֵאתָ, as in Gen. 43. 17. and I have no doubt that both Perf. and Gr. Ven. had this reading before them. Onkelos seems to have read וְהָבֵאתָ, as he renders תֵּל *introducet* [aliquis]. On the whole the Sam. lection is far the more preferable, as all the concomitant injunctions are addressed to Moses in the second person.

Ver. 10. *With their twenty pillars.* The present texts, both Heb. and Sam. have *its pillars*, עֲמֻדָּי; but the right reading, עֲמֻדֵיהֶם, was followed by Sep. and Saad.; and this is, in ver. 11 and 12, the reading of Sam. and in r. p. ch. 38. 10. the reading of both Sam. and Heb.—On the other hand, in

Ver. 16. Although both Texts have עֲמֻדֵיהֶם, followed by Sep. and most of the ant. translators; yet I think we should, with Jerom and Saadiah, read עֲמֻדָּי, *its pillars*, unless we also read קִלְעִים, instead of מִסָּךְ, or consider the latter as a collective noun.

Ver. 18. *Its breadth fifty cubits.* So Sam.; חֲמִשִּׁים בָּמֶסֶךְ. But the present Heb. has חֲמִשִּׁים בְּחֻמָּשִׁים; a very early corruption, as it was followed by all the ant. translators*, the Septuagint not excepted, if the present copies of their version be not also here corrupted. At any rate the Sam. reading is, in my apprehension, evidently the true one; for what sense is there in saying that the breadth of the court was *fifty by fifty*?—O, say the Thargumists, the meaning is, that *the breadth of the court was fifty cubits at the east side, and also fifty cubits at the west side*; or, as our English translators render the Heb. "was fifty every where."—An admirable mode this of describing the breadth of a court! Was the writer afraid lest,

* Except, perhaps, Jerom, whose version is: *In longitudine occupabit atrium cubitos centum, in latitudine quingenta*. He either read not בְּחֻמָּשִׁים, then, or neglected to render it. So Dathe: *Longitudo atrii sit centum cubitorum, latitudo quingenta*.

without this **בְּחֹשֶׁת**, his readers might have been led to think that the court was a trapezium, broader at one end than the other? But then why took he not the same precaution with respect to the length and height, and tell us that the former was *an hundred by an hundred*, and the latter *five by five*?

Ib. *The hangings of the court, &c.* That these and all the other words in Italics, which I have introduced into the text of my Translation, have been dropped out of the original text and all the ant. versions, is clear from the parallel place, ch. 38. 16. and from the evident baldness of the passage as it stands without them. The other additions in this chapter are supported by the authorities noticed among the Various Readings.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Ver. 1. *TO minister to me in the priest's office.* לְכֹהֵן לִי. For such is the genuine Sam. reading, followed by Sep. *ἐπορεύμεν μου*. So also Onk. and Tharg. לשמש קדש; and Syr. למסדו; and so equivalently both Arabs; unless perhaps they found in their copies וכדו, which comes to the same, and would be no improper reading. Aq. Sym. Theod. Perf. and Gr. Ven. read with the present Text, and refer the affix לִי to Aaron; but Montfaucon wrongly joins to them Vulg. which has *fungantur*, not *fungatur*. Let this remark apply to the same word in ver. 3. and 4.

Ver. 7. *At its two extremities shall the joining be.* I read חִבְרָה with Sam. not חִבְרָה, the present Hebrew reading. Perhaps חִבְרָה is still a better reading, and seems to have been that of Sep. Vulg. and Saad.

Ver. 8. *The fancy-work of the shoulder-pieces.* Instead of מְפָדִים I read מְפָדִית, in the plural, with the Septuagint *, who render it by the same word as they had before employed to express כתפיה. Those shoul-der-pieces were *little ephods* annexed to the large one. They who render the word by *band, zone, or belt*, seem not to have attended to the context. They were probably deceived by Onk. and Syr. who probably mistook חֶשֶׁב for חֶבֶשׁ, or read the latter in their copies. And this indeed seems to have been the reading of the other interpreters †, except Vulg. and Gr. Ven. of which the former has *textura*, the latter *λογισμα*.

Of modern interpreters the greater part have *belt, girdle, cinchure*; and among these is Michaëlis; but Le Clerc and Dathe, in my opinion, very properly contend that חֶשֶׁב has never that signification. The version of the former is: *Textura etiam partis oppositæ, quæ adjicietur, ex ipso erit, &c.*; that of the latter, *Et textura anteriori parti opposita ex eadem materia fit*. They both suppose that מְפָדִים denotes the posterior part of the ephod, in opposition to the anterior. Houbigant's translation is: *Et textura LIMBIS ejus, qui super eam erit*. This meaning of מְפָדִים he derives from the Arabic مَفْرَس, *terminus*; but I cannot but agree with Dathe that this is a forced etymon. On the whole I am persuaded that the Septuagint have given the true meaning; and that מְפָדִית here denotes shoul-der-pieces which were affixed to the ephod for greater ornament, somewhat like our *epaulettes*. Yet I will not be contentious about the matter.

* Καὶ τὴν ὑφάμας τῶν ΕΠΩΜΙΑΔΩΝ, ὁ ἐστὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς.

† Joseph. both Arabs and Perf.

Ver. 9. *Onyx-stones*. See the Rem. on ver. 18—21.

Ver. 11. *Thou shalt engrave on the two stones the names of the sons of Israel*. תפתח את שתי האבנים על שמות בני ישראל. Lit. "Thou shalt open the two stones over the names of the 'sons of Israel';" which seems to indicate that the names were first marked on the stones, and the parts thus marked carved out.

Ver. 14. *Of equal length*. מבלות. Evidently derived from נבל; but what precise meaning it has here, it is hard to say. I have followed that which appears to be most agreeable to the context, and in which it was understood by both Arabs; for I cannot fall in with the opinion of Michaëlis, that the *thickness** of the chains is hereby indicated. The Septuagint seem to have read another word in their copy, or to have had in view the Chald. meaning, *miscuit*, as they render καταμειγμενους εν ανθεσις, "intermingled with flowers." Vulg. *sibi invicem coherentes*. Houbigant: *forma tortili implexas*. Junius: *aquabiles*. Dathe: *aequales*. Our common version: "at the ends†."

Ver. 16. *Doubled*. כפל. In my Expl. Note I have expressed a doubt about the signification of this word, and I still think it may only mean that the breast-plate was a *perfect*, or *equilateral*, square. Among other significations in Arabic, כפל denotes *parity*, *similitude*, &c. yet as all the antient interpreters have otherwise explained it, I have followed them. It may have been made *double* for strength, the better to sustain the weight of the precious stones that were to be placed in it.

Ver. 17. In this and the three following verses we have the names of different gems which were set on the pectoral, which I have rendered according to the best of my knowledge; but as many of them are but bare probabilities, I subjoin the original names, with the principal various versions that have been made of them.

1. אדום. This appears from its etymon to have been a gem of a reddish colour; and Onk. Tharg. Syr. both Arabs, and the Sam. translator, have contented themselves with words denoting the same colour: סמך—סמך—סמך—סמך—סמך. The Septuagint, Josephus, and Vulg. have σαρδύς—σάρδύς—*lapis sardius*: the Perfic אקוּר, the *ruby*: and Gr. Ven. αμφαξ, the *carbuncle*. Most modern interpreters are for the *sardius*, or *carnelian* ‡, which I have adopted in my version.

2. פטרה. It is generally agreed that this is the *topaz*. So Sep. Joseph. and Vulg. τσπαζ—τσπαζ—*topazius*. The other Oriental versions have words that denote a light *greenish*, *glass-colour*. Onk. ירקן—Tharg. ירקתא—Syr. ורנא—Arab. Erp. اترار—except Saad. and Perf. both which have words that are supposed to signify the *emerald*—ומרד—אלמס; and so Gr. Ven. σμαραγδίνος.—Most of the modern interpreters have *topaz*.

3. ברקת. That this was some *splendid shining gem*, we may conclude from the meaning of its root, ברק; but as most gems are more or less splendid, this is no certain criterion. The

* From the Arab. نبل, *crassus*. Were I to derive it from any other dialect than the Hebr. I would prefer the Syr. نبل, *fixit*—*composit*, *compact*, *complex*—which might be reconciled with the Greek καταμειγμενους.

† From the old French of Geneva, "aux deux extremités;" but the revised version has "en façon de cordon." Le Gros: "qui se termineront par un bout." See other versions in Poole's *Synopsis*, or in Calmet. ‡ So Pagninus, Luther, Castalio, the French of Geneva, the Dutch, Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis, and our common English version.—Junius, Jarhi, and some other Rabbis, are for the *ruby*. The Greek of Venice stands alone.

Septuagint, Josephus, and Jerom, took it to be the *emerald*, *σμαραγδος*, *smaragdus*. Onk. Tharg. and Syr. retain the Heb. word, and are consequently equally ambiguous. Not less so are the other versions, except Gr. Ven. which has *χρυσολθος* *. Our English translation, with some others, have *carbuncle*. I see no reason to depart from Sep. The *emerald* is described by lithologists to be a very splendid gem: "non mutatur sole, non umbra, non lucernis, sed semper est radians." Plin. lib. xxxvii. c. 5. It could not, then, have a more appropriate Heb. name than ברקת.

4. נֶפֶךְ. Sep. and Jos. *αβριωξ*. Vulg. *carbunculus*. Onk. seems to have had in view the emerald, as he renders the word אֶמְרָגֶדֶן, which in the Polyglott is translated (I know not why) *carbunculus*.—The Thargums here disagree: Bab. has אֶמְרָגֶדֶן, an *emerald*; but Jerus. has כִּדְרִינָה †. Syr. and Saad. have words that denote the *jacinth*. Erp. and Gr. Ven. the *onyx*. Most moderns follow Sep. and Vulg.; and perhaps this is the best thing we can do.

5. סַפִּיר. That this is the *sapphire*, there is little or no doubt. Sep. *σασφειρος* ‡—Vulg. *saphirus*—and so the general run of commentators, both antient and modern.

6. הָלֶם. This is commonly rendered a *diamond*; but by Sep. *ιασπισ*. So Vulg. *iaspis*. The other ant. versions vary; and all are mere guess-work. Against the *diamond* it has been objected that it is too hard to be engraved upon; but Büsching asserts that such *diamonds* exist, and may be seen in some museums. I doubt very much, however, if there were any such diamond on the breast-plate of Aaron. The argument, in favour of the diamond, derived from etymology, is but weak. It is so called, say lexicographers, because it breaks all other gems, and cannot be broken by any; from הלם, *contundere*. The argument would be just as good for a stone of a quite opposite quality, namely, one that could be easily broken; for הלם means *contundi* as well as *contundere*; and indeed I am apt to think that the *crystal* is here meant. Michaëlis and Dathe retain the Hebrew name *jabalom*.

7. לִשָּׁם. Rendered by Sep. *λεγειριον*, by Jos. *λεγιρος*, and by Vulg. *ligurius*; whose joint authority I prefer to that of the other versions, which vary and are ambiguous. Most moderns are agreed that it is the *ligure*.

8. שָׁבוּ. Sep. *αχατης*. Vulg. *achates*. Josephus has here *αμεθυσος*; but I believe this to be only a transposition (as before in the second triad), as he has *αχατης* immediately after.—Of the other ant. versions some have the *beryl* and some the *sapphires*. The moderns are in general for the *agate* §.

9. אֲחֻלָּה. Sep. *αμεθυσος*; Vulg. *amethystus*; which has been adopted by almost all the moderns.

10. חֲרֹשֶׁשׁ. Sep. and Jos. *χρυσολθος*; Vulg. *chrysolithus*; adopted by most interpreters; but, with Abarbanel, I believe it to be the *beryl*.

11. שָׁדֵם. That this is the *onyx* ||, or *sardonyx*, interpreters are nearly agreed. Abarbanel and the Gr. Ven. took it to be the *crystal*; others the *beryl*.

* From Jerom we learn that Symmachus had *νεφαιριος*. † So the Polyglott; but I find, in an ant. edition of Venice, כִּדְרִינָה; and I suspect, with Ugolini, that the original reading was כִּדְרִינָה, the same with the *charchedonius* of Pliny; that is, the *carbuncle*. ‡ Josephus has here *ιασπισ*; unless the word has been transposed, for *σασφειρος* follows it.

§ The Greek of Venice here agrees with Sep. in all the three names of the third row: *σιγεις δε ο τριτος, λεγειριον, αχατης και αμεθυσος*; and so perhaps Saadias. || I suspect that there is here a transposition in Sep.; and that *ονυχιον* stood originally before *βηρυλλιον*, as it is in Vulg. and Josephus.

12. יָסָפֶר. There is little doubt of this being the *jasper*; yet Josephus and Jerom have *βαρύλλας*, *beryllus*; and, if we suppose a transposition in Sep. that is also their reading.

I shall conclude in the words of a sensible and modest Rabbi *.—“ For my part, I confess my ignorance of the particular species of precious stones here mentioned, and wonder at the confusion which I see in Onkelos and the other Thargumists.”—This learned Jew thinks that the most probable names of the twelve gems are, the *carneian*, the *topaz*, the *ceramnia*, the *carbuncle*, the *sapphire*, the *diamond*, the *turquoise* or *turquoise*, the *jacinth*, the *onyx*, the *chrysolite*, the *emerald*, and the *jasper*.

Ver. 21. The text here only tells us that the names of the sons of Israel were engraven on those gems: but the Jewish interpreters go farther, and pretend to tell us what name was inscribed on each particular gem. In this, however, they are not agreed. According to both the Thargums, the names of REUBEN, SIMEON, and LEVI, were written on the first row. On the second were written the names of JUDAH, DAN, and NEPHTHALI, according to Tharg. Bab.; but, according to Jerus. JUDAH, ISSACHAR, and ZEBULON. On the third row, according to Bab. were the names of GAD, ASHER, and ISSACHAR; but, according to Jerus. DAN, NEPHTHALI, and GAD. On the fourth row, according to Bab. were written the names of ZEBULON, JOSEPH, and BENJAMIN; but, according to Jerus. ASHER, JOSEPH, and BENJAMIN.—But Abarbanel arranges them in the following order: JUDAH, ISSACHAR, ZEBULON, REUBEN, SIMEON, GAD, EPHRAIM, MANASSEH, BENJAMIN, DAN, ASHER, NEPHTHALI.—He pretends that they were thus arranged, agreeably to their mode of marching, under four different standards, as is related in Numb. 2. But in this, I believe, he is deserted by all his brethren.

Ver. 22. I have in my version inclosed this verse in brackets, as I suspect it to be an interpolation. If it be not, the chains here mentioned are either the same with those of ver. 14, or met them half way; for Houbigant's idea, that the former, like the cords of a deacon's *dalmatic* †, served to widen or tighten the neck of the ephod, is hardly compatible with the text.

After ver. 22. Sep. Rom. Ald. Alex. have what is, in the Heb. ver. 29, and then proceed thus: Καὶ ἔθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ λογιὸν τῆς κρισεως τοὺς κρωσσούς—ταὶ ἀλυσίδωνται ἐπ' αὐμοφτεῶν τῶν κλιτῶν τῷ λογιῷ ἐπιθήσονται. The first colon is a part of ver. 23, and the second colon the substance of ver. 24. But, after this, the whole of ver. 25, 26, 27, and 28, is wanting ‡. They are, however, in the Complutensian edition, and in the Oxf. and Canon. MSS. with some variety of reading of little moment, and they will probably be found in other copies, when Dr. Holmes's collations appear. The reader who is curious to see the Greek of these verses may consult Bos, who has given an exact transcript of Complut. except that κρωσσούς, with an *omega*, is twice put for κροσσούς, which is a better reading than that of Ald. and Rom. and is also that of Alex.

* Rabbi Abraham Ben David; whose *Dissertatio de Vestitu Sacerdotum Hebræorum* was published, in Hebrew and Latin, by Ugolini, in his 13th vol. of Heb. Antiquities. The curious reader may consult this well-written tract; Ugolini's *Sacerdotium Hebræicum*, in the same volume; and the well-known work of Braunius, *De Vestitu Sacerd. Hebr.*

† An official vestiment worn by deacons and subdeacons of the Romish church.

‡ The whole is likewise wanting in Glasg.

Ver. 29. This verse seems here out of its place. In most copies of Sep. it is immediately after ver. 22, where it certainly comes in more naturally; but it would be still more naturally placed after ver. 21; and, if verse 22 be deemed an interpolation, that would, in the Greek, be its place. The text then would run thus: Ver. 21. "The stones shall be, for the names of the sons of Israel, twelve, according to their names: the engravings, *like those* of a signet, shall have each its *peculiar* name, according to the twelve tribes." Ver. 29. "And Aaron, when he goeth into the sanctuary, shall bear on his heart the names of the sons of Israel, *that* are on the judicial breast-plate, as a perpetual memorandum before the Lord."—Every one sees that the words are here most suitable to the context, whereas they come in somewhat awkwardly after ver. 28.

Ver. 30. URIM and THUMIM. אֶת הַחֹרִים וְאֶת הַתּוֹמִים. What sort of ornaments were these? It is hard even to guess, and perhaps impossible to guess with any degree of certainty. If we attend to the grammatical meaning of the Hebrew words they signify LIGHTS* and PERFECTIONS; that is, I ween, *knowledge* and *integrity*: two qualifications highly necessary for a supreme teacher and judge, such as the high-priest was meant to be.—By Sep. the words are rendered ΔΗΛΩΣΙΝ καὶ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ: by Jerom, DOCTRINAM et VERITATEM: by Ouk. and Tharg. יֵת חֹרִים וְיֵת תּוֹמִים, equivalent in meaning to the Hebrew: by Syr. נִדְרָא וְשִׁלְמָא, much to the same purport: by Saad. אֶלְמִנְחָר וְאֶלְצִחָח, a literal version of the Heb. and in the plural number: Arab. Erp. أَلْمَنْحَارُ وَالْأَصْحَاحُ, equally literal: Perf. retains the very Heb. words: Gr. Ven. τῶν ἐμφανέων καὶ τῶν τελειότητων.

But none of these renderings give us any explanation of the nature of the *Urim* and *Thumim*, of what materials they were composed, or what was their form. Hence various conjectures have been made. Braunius, and others, have laboured to prove that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were the precious stones themselves; and that the words, being both in the plural, denote *the most perfect splendor*, which must have arisen from such a variety of gems. They fancy that two parallel places are favourable to their opinion: Exod. 39. 8. and Levit. 8. 8. In the former, say they, where the breast-plate is fully described, there is no mention made of the *Urim* and *Thumim*; and in the latter the *Urim* and *Thumim* only are mentioned, without any notice of the precious stones. But the answer is obvious. In Exod. 39. 8. there was no need of describing the *Urim* and *Thumim* as part of the breast-plate, as they were indeed no part of it; they were only placed over it. But in Levit. 8. 8. they are very properly mentioned, not as a part of the breast-plate, but as something evidently distinct from it: "Over it [the robe] he put the ephod and the breast-plate, which he fastened to the fancy-work of the ephod; and on [or over] the breast-plate he put the *Urim* and *Thumim*."—It is remarkable that, in ch. 28, after ver. 30. the Sam. exemplar has this addition: "Thou shalt also make the URIM and THUMIM †;" which why it should be an interpolation, I see no solid reason. But, be that as it may, to me it appears evident that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were not the gems of the breast-plate, nor any part of the breast-plate properly so called.

* Spencer thinks that the word would be better rendered *fires*; but his reasons are far from being cogent.

† And again, ch. 39. 22. "They also made the *Urim* and *Thumim*, as the Lord had given in command to Moses."

Michaelis imagined that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were *three lots*, in use among the Hebrews, long before this period; one of which was *affirmative*, another *negative*, and the third *neutral*—that the breast-plate was *made double*, in the form of a purse, to receive those lots, which, when drawn, announced the divine will or left it dubious.—Mere imagination!

Most rational is the opinion of Spencer; namely, that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were little images, or *theraphs*; and that the idea was borrowed from the Egyptians. From *Ælian*; indeed, we learn that the Egyptian priests were at the same time judges; and that the arch-priest wore about his neck an image of sapphire-stone, called *Truth**, the very word which is employed by the Septuagint and Jerom to express the Hebrew *Thumim*. Whether the high-priest of the Hebrews wore two figures, one representing *knowledge*, the other *integrity*, or whether, as Spencer thinks, they were both but one figure, is a matter of controversy; but that they were figures, or a figure, of some kind, appears to me clear from a passage of *Hoseah*, 3. 4. “For the children of Israel shall be many days without a king and without a chief, without sacrifice and without an altar †, and without an ephod and theraphs:” where *theraphs*, or *theraphim*, is equivalent to the *Urim* and *Thumim* of Exodus.—The history of Michah, Jud. 17. leads to the same conclusion; for, whether we suppose that his *ephod* and *theraphs* were made for an idolatrous purpose or not ‡, it is clear that they were made in imitation of the high-priest’s garniture; and that *theraphs* there, as in *Hoseah*, are equivalent to the *Urim* and *Thumim*.

One is apt to wonder that the materials and form of the *Urim* and *Thumim* are not as minutely described as the other ornaments; but this is no weak proof that they were not a novel thing, and that they were well known to the Israelites before. The use of *theraphs*, in religion, is of great antiquity. *Rabel* stole the theraphs of her father, which he calls his gods. Gen. 31. 30. The Egyptians had their *seraps*, or *seraphs*; which, with *Kircher*, I take to be the very same with the Hebrew *theraphs* §. I know that *Spencer* and others will not allow that *theraphim* is an Egyptian word, but think that it is the same with *seraphim* ||; but

* Διασσαι δε, το αρχαιον, παρ Αιγυπτίοις ιερείς. ησαν ην δε τετων αρχων ο προεχουτος και ειδικαζεν απαντας εδ δε αυτον ειναι δικαιοτατον ανθρωπον και αφειδιστατον ειχε δε και ΑΓΑΛΜΑ περι τον αυχενα, εκ σαρφειρς λιθου, και εκλειτο αγαλμα ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ. *Ælian*. Var. Hist. lib. xiv. c. 33. See also *Dion. Hal.* lib. i. c. 3. or *Spencer*, lib. iii. dissert. vii. c. 1. where the subject is almost exhausted.

† The present Heb. Text has מַצֵּבָה, a statue. But the true reading is evidently מִצְבָּה.

‡ See the Rem. on that place.

§ “Erant autem Ægyptiis simu-

la lacra quedam pueri specie, quæ vocabantur nomine Ægyptiaco SERAPIS: hæc adorabant illi, de future et abscon-

ditis ea interrogantes. Omnibus in locis celebrioribus urbium ea collocabant, adolentes ante ea, secum quoque ea

contra eventus malorum portare solebant. Atque hæc idola similia sunt THERAPHIM, quæ Israelitæ colebant, et

quæ Laban adorasse Scriptura memorat; et dicitur, quod domestici Abraham, in Ægypto commorantes, ea secum

reduces attulerunt.” *Abenephias* apud *Kircher*. Synag. iv. c. iii. vol. i. p. 259; who adds: “Atque ex his colli-

gitur, hos Hebræorum Theraphim nihil aliud fuisse quam Serapei Ægyptiorum, cum non duntaxat nomine, sed forma,

ritibusque quæis colebantur hujus modi idola in omnibus sibi exactè correspondere.”

|| “Fortasse theraphim

angelorum fuerunt imagines, aut angelis dicatæ. Unde spiritus angelicus eas subibat, ac consulentibus per eas ora-

cula edebant. Ex hac conjectura מִצְבָּה mibi idem effiet quod מַצֵּבָה, notissimum angelorum nomen.” *Ludovic.*

de *Dieu* in Gen. 31. 19.—So also *Gaffarellus* (apud *Spencer*) opinatur “Theraphim figuras fuisse a Mose legislatore

permissas, a Labane aliisque Orientalibus ante legem piç usurpatas, quibus mediantibus voluntatem suam Deus non

raro patefecit: et cherubinorum et seraphinorum figuras fuisse generis ejusdem.”

their arguments are far from being convincing, and the opinion of Kircher is, in my apprehension, much more rational.

It will be asked, perhaps, how oracles, or divine responses, were given by means of the *Urim* and *Thumim*. To this question I must plead my ignorance, and with others only give my own conjecture. The Thalmudists, who believe that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were the same with the stones of the breast-plate, tell us that the names of the twelve patriarchs engraved on those stones, together with the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and moreover these words, כל אלה עבדי ישראל; contain all the elements necessary for forming any individual word of the Hebrew language; and that when the high-priest, wearing them on his ephod, turned his face to the ark, the letters on the pectoral became alternately more splendid than usual, from which the priest combined his responses as we combine the signals of a telegraph.

Others, who cannot swallow this Thalmudical camel, as Spencer calls it, are of opinion, that when the priest, vested with his ephod, invoked God after a certain known form, his mind was illuminated by the Holy Ghost, and his responses thereby became those of Heaven. This was the opinion of Kimhi and Bechai among the Jews, and of several Christian commentators, of whom I shall only quote below the words of Rivet*.

A third opinion is that of Josephus, adopted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Auflin, Suidas, Grotius, and some others; namely, that both the onyx-stones on the shoulder of the ephod and the twelve gems on the breast-plate revealed the will of God by changing their colour, and becoming brighter than usual when a favourable response was given. Των γὰρ λίθων οὓς ἐπὶ των ὤμων φέρειν τον αρχιερεα προεβπον, συνεβαινε λαμπειν, ὅποτε ταῖς ἱερουργίαις ὁ Θεὸς παρρη, τον ἕτερον τον ἐπὶ τῷ δεξιῷ των ὤμων πεπορημενον, αὐγῆς ἀποπληθύνει και τοῖς πορρωτάτω φαινομένης, ου προτερον ταύτης ὑπαρχούσης τῷ λίθῳ . . . ὁ δεξι ταῖς θαυμασιωτερον εἶρω διὰ γὰρ των δωδεκα λίθων, οὓς κατὰ στερον δ αρχιερεὺς ενερχομενους τῷ Εὐστηθι φερει, νικην μελλουσι πολεμεν προμηνην ὁ Θεὸς τοσαυτη γὰρ ἀπηγορεύεται ἀπ' αὐτων αὐγῆ, μητιω τῆς σφρατῆς κεκλυμένης, ὡς τῷ πληθεῖ παντὶ γνωριμον εἶναι το παρρη τον Θεον εἰς την ἐπικουριαν. Ant. lib. iii. c. 8. n. 9.

Spencer, after having copiously treated on the subject in fifty-five folio pages, sums up his own opinion in a few words thus: "Dicam verbo, asserit hypothesis mea, Deum e pectorali voce formata respondisse, mediante simulachro præsentia angelica animato, et in hominis forte speciem efficto; utpote organo, quo nullum, ad vocem formandam vel præsentiam illam indicandam, magis aptum et decorum, aut oracula tradendi modo in sancto sanctorum usitato magis conforme fingi potest."—According to this hypothesis, the *Urim* and *Thumim* was but one and the same little puppet, inclosed in the breast-plate as in a purse, and which, animated by an angel, whispered articulate responses in the ears of the high-priest, who communicated them to the people.

Spēctatum admiffi, rifum teneatis amice!

* "Non absurdum videtur, si dicamus, ex pacto et promissione institutoris, Deum invocatum a sacerdote certo ritu, gemmas illas gestante, respondisse non articulata aliqua voce, sed per illuminationem intellectus illius, et certam persuasionem inditam menti ipsius de veritate responsi: nullam itaque vim fuisse in lapidibus, nisi tanquam in morali causa: a Deo fuisse effectum, qui ad illius præsentiam operabatur occulto quodam modo." Rivet. in Exod. 28. 30.

Perhaps ye will equally laugh at my own opinion, which is, that the *Urim* and *Thumim* were indeed little images, or a little image, like that worn by the Egyptian priests, and hanging from the neck of the wearer over the breast-plate, but which neither spoke, nor moved, nor changed their colour: they were mere emblems of the two-fold duty of a sacerdotal judge, *Truth* and *Integrity*; and the responses given by the high-priest were, most probably, such as in his own best judgment were proper for the occasion; and he might readily be supposed by the people to be divinely inspired, when, robed in his pontificals, he spoke in his judicial capacity; much in the same manner as the Pope is, by many Roman Catholics, supposed to be infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*, and, as they term it, *clavi non errante*. The figures might, originally, have been merely emblematical; but superstition is ever busy in perverting original ideas, and what was at first an innocent, perhaps a useful, representation, becomes gradually an idle, and often a profane, ceremony. Thus the crucifix, intended at first as a simple memorial of the death of Christ, obtained by degrees what was called a *relative worship*, and at length a direct species of adoration that seemed to border on idolatry. The Roman Catholics of the present age generally disclaim all such worship, yet vestiges of the doctrine still remain in their liturgical books; and, unless the terms be softened by ingenious explanations, they are highly hyperbolic.

Ver. 36. *A petal of pure gold.* צִיץ דָּבָר זָהָב. The word צִיץ is variously rendered. Sep. and Gr. Ven. *πεταλον*—Vulg. *laminam*—Onk. and Tharg. *מִצָּץ*—Syr. כִּלְמָל, *a crown*—Both Arabs, *مِزَاب*, *a fillet*—Sam. Vcrf. כֶּסֶף, *a plate*—Perf. בִּלְי, *a flower*.—That צִיץ denotes a flower, there is no doubt; or at least some part of a flower: and Josephus asserts that the flower which this ornament resembled is the *ben-bane*, or *hyoscyamus**: but as he probably describes the mitre, or turban, as it was worn by the high-priest of his own time, we cannot be certain that it was exactly the same with that of Aaron, especially as he makes the plate of gold, on which was the inscription, a different ornament from the flower, whereas the text of Exodus says it was on the צִיץ. By צִיץ, then, and by the *πεταλον* of Sep. I would understand the flower-leaf, or *petal*, of some splendid flower, imitated in gold, on which were written the words קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה, HOLY TO THE LORD; or, as some render, HOLINESS TO THE LORD.—Sep. ἈΓΙΑΣΜΑ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ—Vulg. *sanctum domino*—And so equivalently all the other ant. versions; even Gr. Ven. ὁγών τῷ ὁσιότητι. Our first English translations have “The holiness of the Lord,” with Luther, Junius, the Dutch, and others; but our last revisors followed Pagninus, the Genevans, and Tigurines: *Sanctitas Domino*—*La sainteté à l’Eternel*—*Sanctitas ipsi Jehovah*.—More properly Castalio: *Jova sacrum*: adopted by Dathe.—Michaëlis: *Dei Jehovah beilig*.—Houbigant, with Vulg.: *Sanctum Domino*.

Ver. 39. *The tight tunic, and the mitre, thou shalt make of cotton.* The Hebrew is: וְשָׂנִי וְשֵׁשׁ מִצְנֶפֶת מְצֻמֶּת: literally rendered, by Montanus, *Et stringes tunicam byssi, et facies cydarim byssi*; and, by our English translators, “And thou shalt embroider the coat of fine linen; and thou shalt make the mitre of fine linen.”—The Syriac translator seems to have had before him a different reading, as he renders וְעָבַד כִּתְמָת בִּצְמָת, *and make a tunic of byssus*.

* Περιερχεται δε στεφανος χρυσεος, επι τριστηνχιαν κεχαλκευμενος· θαλλει δ’ αυτη καλοζ χρυσεος τη σακχαρι βοτανη παρ’ ημων λεγομενη απομεινιμημενος, υως δε κωαμον Ελληνων οι περι τομας ριζων ευμειρως εχοντες προσαγορευουσιν. Aut. lib. iii. c. 7. n. 6.

Did he read *ועשית* instead of *שבצת*, or consider the latter as equivalent? This version led me to imagine that the original reading might be *ועשית הכנת חשבץ*; and I rendered accordingly; so much the more readily as there was no danger of making a great mistake. But, from posterior considerations, I am apt to think that the Text is sound, but that its meaning has been generally mistaken. All the antient translators considered *שבצת* as a verb, except the Septuagint, who render *και αι κοσσυμβωται * των χειρων εκ βυσσων*. In like manner they had rendered *חשבץ*, in ver. 4, *κοσσυμβωται*. Scharfenberg suspects that they read *כשבצת*. They certainly considered it as a noun, and both it and *כיתבות* in the plural number; but it is not so clear that they read *כשבצות*. They may have read *שבצת*; for *שבצת* may be a noun from *שבץ*, in the form of *אֲדָרֶת* from *אדר*. But, still, what is the meaning of *κοσσυμβωται*, or *κοσσυμβαι*? It is rendered *nodi* by Nobilius. According to others it is the same with *κροσσοις finbria*. From Pollux we learn, that the Athenians, instead of *κοσσυμβας*, or *κοσσυμβη*, used *κρωβυλος*, or *κρωβυλη*, a *hair-net*, or *top-knot* †. I believe the radical meaning of the word is to be found in the Syriac and Arabic *שבץ*, to *minge*, *intermix*, *perplex*: hence metaphorically *anguish*, *uneasiness*, *perplexity*. Adhering to its literal signification, then, the *שבצת* of Exodus may be rendered two ways; as a verb, or as a noun. The Sam. text is evidently for a verb, as it has *ועשית את השבצת*; and this is followed by Houbigant and Dathe, *Et texes tunicam*. But I am inclined to prefer the Heb. reading, which wants *את*, and which was not read by Sep. and to take the preceding *שבצת* for a noun: "The texture of the tunic shall be of cotton:" or, if the word be supposed to signify a *fringe* or *trimming*, (which I question,) the version might be either "Let the fringe of the tunic be cotton, or "Thou shalt fringe the tunic with cotton."

Ver. 40. *Turbans*, *מכבצות*. It is a different word from that which denotes the *mitre* of Aaron, namely, *מצנפת*; and the turbans of the inferior priests were probably of a different form; yet the Septuagint render both by the same word *καδαρις*, and Jerom by *tiara* ‡: but all the other versions distinguish them. Here Onk. and Tharg. have *בובען*, of the same meaning with the Hebrew—Syr. *כלוא*, *caps*—Saad. *קלאנס*, *coifs*—Erp. *ברארית*, *biretta*, *caputiu*, still called in Italian *berretta* §, and *barrette* in French—Sam. Verf. *מנבען*; the Heb. word Samaritanized—Perf. *מכרחה*, *caps*—Gr. Ven. *κεφαλους*, *head-pieces*.

Ver. 41. *Initiate them in their office*. *מלאת את ידם*. Lit. *thou shalt fill their hand*; that is, thou shalt give them power to fulfil their respective offices, by putting in their hands the implements of their various functions. We have an English word which well expresses the thing, to *handse*; but I fear it would be deemed vulgar. According to the Roman Ponti-

* In the Polyglott it is wrongly printed *κοσσυμβωται*. Ald. Compl. and Alex. have *κοσσυμβαι*. According to Montfaucon and the Roman Scholia, Aq. Sym. and Theod. had *αι συσφιγγεις*; but Scharfenberg, with reason, believes that they wrote *και συσφιγγεις*, and that this latter word is not a noun, but the 2. p. f. of the future of *συσφινω*; they are, therefore, to be ranked with those who considered *שבצת* to be a verb. † Of the other versions,

Vulg. has *stringu*: Onk. *חרכץ*, rendered in Pol. *stringes*, but by Buxtorf *refeklatam facies*. I believe the meaning to be as uncertain as that of the Heb. word, which is retained in Tharg. Saad. *חך*, and Erp. *חנץ*, both denoting *embroidering*, making *ahad-boles*. Perf. *חך כרס*, *gold-woven*; as if the tunic, or, as he calls it, the *sbirt*, *חֲבִירָה*, had been made of *brocade*. Gr. Ven. *φελιδωτος*; a word of his own making perhaps, from *φελος*, a *scale*, *squama*; and metaphorically *variegation*, *τεταλμα*. ‡ Nor is any difference made by Josephus. § "Copertura del capo, di-

verla dal capello, che si fa in varie foggie, e di diversi drappi." Dict. Crusc.

fical, a door-keeper, *officiarius*, is initiated by touching with his right hand the keys of the church; a lector by touching the book of lessons; an exorcist by touching a book of exorcisms, or a missal; an acolyte by touching a candlestick with an unlighted candle in it, and an empty cruet*; a sub-deacon by touching an empty chalice and paten, two cruetts with wine and water in them, a small basin and napkin†, and a book of the epistles that are read throughout the year; a deacon by touching a book of the gospels; a priest by receiving into his hands a chalice with wine and water in it, and above it a paten with a wafer on it; and a bishop by receiving a pastoral staff, a ring, and a book of the gospels. All this, in the language of the Hebrews, might be called *filling their hands*‡.

Ver. 42. *Wrappers of linen.* מִכְנֵסִי בָר. This is the first time that the word בָר occurs with respect to clothing, and on the authority of Sep. and Vulg. it has been generally believed to signify linen. That opinion I followed in this part of my version; but I am now convinced that the word cannot mean *linen* made of *flax*; which, whether raw or manufactured, is uniformly expressed by פָּשִׁת. Besides, it is clear, from ch. 39. 28. that these *wrappers*, or *drawers*, were made of *byssus*, שֵׁשׁ; but שֵׁשׁ has been shewn to denote *cotton*: בָר, therefore, cannot signify *linen*. It was this consideration that made me change my opinion, but too late to correct my version of the present verse. I now think that בָר denotes something *singular*, either in the *make* or *use* of the garment to which it is joined. If from the present passage, and others in which the words occur in the Pentateuch only, we were to form a decision, I should certainly think that it implied nothing more than a piece of clothing, of *singular* and *peculiar* use, which the priest was to wear when employed in his sacred functions: and this would perfectly agree with the radical signification of בָרַד. But from other passages of Scripture one might imagine that its singularity was derived from its *fineness*. David, at the removal of the ark, was clothed with a vestment of בָר, which the Greek translator renders εἰς ἐξ αἰῶνος, *an uncommonly fine robe*; Arab. نَبِيْهَةٌ مِّنْ دَرَمَسَ; and myself a *precious ephod*. See C. R. 2 Sam. 6. 14. Brannius and Michaëlis think that בָר and שֵׁשׁ are one and the same thing; but this cannot be, as in Exod. 39. they are both mentioned together: מִכְנֵסִי דָבָר שֵׁשׁ. I would rather say that דָבָר here expresses the fineness of the *cotton*, than that it is a mere pleonasm; and in that case it would still come into the idea of *singularity*, and preserve its genuine etymon.

C H A P. XXIX.

Ver. 5. *WHICH thou shalt fasten to the fancy-work of the ephod.* וְהִסַּדְתָּ לוֹ בְּדָשֵׁב דָּמַד. Lit. *Thou shalt fasten to it the ephod at the fancy-work*; for so, I think, we ought to understand the comma, referring the word לוֹ not to Aaron, but to דָּמַד.

Ver. 6. *The badge of holiness*; or, perhaps better, *consecration*. נֹר דָּקֶשׁ. I render נֹר by the word *badge*, as most analogous to the radical meaning of the word, which denotes a pecu-

* With which he is to bring wine and water for the purpose of consecration.
the celebrant's fingers after the oblations.

† *Filling hands*, in the church of England's ritual, is more simple:
A New Testament is delivered to a deacon, but a whole Bible to a priest and bishop.

liar dedication of one's self to any particular office. The Septuagint here use the same word as for $\pi\upsilon\lambda\alpha$ in the last chapter, $\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$, and Jerom *luminam*: the rest a $\sigma\tau\epsilon\psi\eta\nu$, or *diadem*, except Symmachus, who has $\alpha\phi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$, which favours my version.

Ver. 13. *The excrescence of the liver.* וְדִרְתָּ עַל הַכֹּבֶד. Sep. $\tau\omicron\nu\ \lambda\omicron\beta\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\grave{\eta}\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ —Vulg. *reticulum jecoris*; and so equivalently Onk. and Syr.: but both Arabs have very properly وَدَرْتَا , *superfluity*; and Gr. Ven. $\tau\omicron\ \pi\epsilon\pi\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$. I have, with them, preferred a general term to an uncertain particular one. My deceased friend Mr. S. Street thought it might be the gall-bladder. The greater number of modern interpreters take it to be the greater lobe of the liver, together with the gall-bladder.

Ver. 18. *It is a sweet-favoured holocaust to the Lord.* The text is: $\text{עֹלָה הִוא לַיהוָה רִיחַ נְיָחֹחַ}$ * וְאִשָּׁהּ , by Montanus rendered *Holocaustum hoc Domino, odor quietis; ignitio Domino ipsa*: and our common version, "It is a burnt-offering unto the Lord: it is a sweet favour, an offering made by fire unto the Lord." But there is no need of this tautology to express the full force of the original, as the words עֹלָה in the first comma, and וְאִשָּׁהּ in the last, are both sufficiently expressed by *holocaust*.

Ver. 22. *The fat large tail.* וְהָאֵלֶּה. There is nothing for this in the common copies of Sep. †; but the Roman scholiast says: "Alius interpres addit ex Hebræo $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\eta\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$." Vulg. *caudam*.—There is no doubt of its being the great fat tail of the Syrian and Arabian sheep, which sometimes weighs twenty pounds. See Shaw's *Travels*, Ruffel's *Hist. of Aleppo*, or Harmer's *Observations*, vol. iv. p. 164.

Ver. 27. *The shoulder that hath been beaved as an beave-offering.* שֵׁן הַתְּרוֹמָה אֲשֶׁר וְזָרוּם. Sep. $\tau\omicron\nu\ \beta\epsilon\rho\alpha\chi\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\phi\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\phi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$. Vulg. *armum quem de ariete separasti*. More properly Saadias: $\text{סָמָךְ אֶלְרִפְעָה אֶלְדִּי רִפְעָה}$, *the shoulder of elevation which thou hast elevated*: and so, in a somewhat different form, Arab. Erp.

Ver. 30. Our common version here makes וְאִשָּׁהּ an adverb; and renders "when he cometh into the tabernacle;" but against all the antients: even Gr. Ven. has $\delta\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$; and indeed the sense requires it. Delgado's correction is therefore just: "And he of his sons that shall be priest in his stead, who goes into the tabernacle to minister in the holy place, shall put them on seven days ‡." This is evidently the meaning of the text; but this is not the only place of a thousand where the common version, by sticking too closely to the arrangement of the Hebrew words, is embarrassed and faulty.

Ver. 32 and 33. The Sam. copy divides after the first וְאִתָּם , and reads וְאִתָּם־ without the copulative, which was not read by Sep. Vulg. Syr. and which I believe to be the genuine lection. This division is preferable, followed by Jerom. *Panes quoque, qui sunt in camistro, in vestibulo tabernaculi comedent*. And the Septuagint should, in my opinion, be divided in the same manner, beginning verse 32, with the editions of Francfort and Venice, at $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\gamma\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, or making ver. 32 and 33 but one, and placing the colon after αυτα , thus: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\iota\ \text{Αγρων και οι υιοι αυτου τα κρεα τα κρεα, και τας αγτους τες εν τη κανη: παρα τας θυρας της}$

* The Sam. copy has וְאִתָּם before וְאִתָּם־ .

† Elsewhere they render it $\alpha\sigma\phi\upsilon\nu$.

‡ The verse is also well

translated by Bate. I wonder that Dathe and Michaëlis translate otherwise, when Le Clerc and Houbigant had set them a better example.

§ For such is the reading of 4 mss. The printed Text has וְאִתָּם־ .

σκήνης του μαρτυρίου ἑδονται αὐτοί, ἐν οἷς ἡγιασθήσαν, κ. τ. λ. Or ver. 33 may begin with Παρετας; which is the division I have followed in my version.

Ver. 36. *Thou shalt sacrifice.* Lit. *Thou shalt do.* So in Latin, *Cum faciam vitulo.* Virgil. —In this verse again our common translation is erroneous: על המזבח על המזבח cannot signify “thou shalt cleanse the altar;” although the Septuagint even give it that meaning: *Καὶ καθαρίσεις τὸ θυσιαστήριον*—and Vulg. *Mundabisque altare.* Much better here Gr. Ven. *Καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὺς ἐπὶ τῷ θυτήριον.* Delgado saw this, and properly corrected the English version: “Thou shalt offer it for a sin-offering upon the altar.” The preposition *ἐν* excludes the other signification. See Houbigant; who, nevertheless, in my apprehension, has not hit upon the true meaning. His version is, *et quoniam macula eris in altari, dum tu expiabis eum* [Aaronem,] *altare inunges, &c.*—I believe I have rightly rendered; yet Le Clerc, Dathe and Michaëlis follow Luther, and the earliest modern interpreters. Bate is an exception, whose version is: “and thou shalt burn it upon the altar;” explained in his note thus: “Heb. *thou shalt sin* it upon the altar; i. e. do with it what was done to the sin-offering.”

Ver. 43. *And by my glory shall the place be sanctified.* Delgado blames our translators for supplying here the word “tabernacle,” and thinks that the antecedent to נקדש is ישראל*. This idea is favoured by the reading of Sam. נקדש; but 4 Sam. mss. read with Heb. and so read Jerom, both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven. But Sep. Syr. Ouk. Tharg. seem to have read נקדשתי, *I will be sanctified.* In my version I adhere to the common reading, and make *place* the supplied antecedent, with the English of Geneva, Bruccioli, the Tigurines, &c.

CHAP. XXX.

SEE the remarks of the first ten verses of this chapter, after the 18th verse of chap. 25, p. 267.

Ver. 18. *With its cover.* וכנן. Which our translators render *and his foot, or stand, or base*, after Sep. and all the antient, and most modern, interpreters, in the supposition that the word is derived from כן. But it may come from כנן; and, although I consider not the *dagesbed nun* as an indisputable proof, it is sufficient to make one doubt at least, as it tells us that the punctator, whoever he was, considered the word as coming from what is called a *geminated root*. As כן then, in Arab. signifies to *cover*, it is very probable that כן here denotes a *cover*. This derivation was first thought of by Louis de Dieu, and has been adopted by Clemens†, Dathe, Schulze, Rosenmüller. And, indeed, we might expect to find a *cover* for the *laver* mentioned among the utensils of the tabernacle. As the laver stood in the open court, the water would soon be liable to be sullied without such a cover ‡.

Ver. 19.

* So Luther, Junius, the revised version of Geneva, Le Cene, Dathe, and others. Bate, after Jerom, makes it the *altar*. Castalio, Le Clerc, Michaëlis, supply *tabernacle*. Houbigant, with our Coverdale, follows the reading of Sep.

† In his *Dissertatio de labro aneo*, printed at Groeningen in 1732. ‡ “Usus quidem, cui hoc labrum destinatum fuit, necessarium fecit, ut operculo esset obtectum. Nam quis non intelligit, aquam facile potuisse inquinari, cum vas sub dîo, non in loco tecto esset collocatum? Deinde Moyses, quoties hujus labri mentionem injicit, “*imprimis*

Ver. 19. *And by it thou shalt place water.* ונתת שמה מים. Rendered by our translators: "And thou shalt put water therein." And so Sep.: *Kai excheis eis auton uδap*: and equivalently Jerom: *Et misit aquā*. I follow the Sam. reading, מים*, which was that of Onk. Syr. Tharg. Perf. Arab. Erp. and even of Gr. Ven. *δωσεις τ' σκελ υδωρ*. The water was laid beside the laver, to be used when necessary.

Ver. 23. *Five hundred parts.* In the original there is only *five hundred*, חמס פסח; and it is disputed what word ought to be supplied. Some are for *shekels*, as Sep. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. Saad.; but Syr. Erp. and Gr. Ven. supply no word. The moderns have generally supplied *shekels*; some few, *gheras*. I have rather chosen to say proportional *parts*, as in medical receipts: *Take five PARTS* of such and such things each, *ana*. If all the parts here mentioned had weighed a *shekel*, an *bin* of oil would not have been sufficient to give them the necessary liquidity; unless, with Michaëlis, we reduce the *shekel* of Moses to one *fourth* or *fifth* part of latter *shekels*.

Ver. 33. *Or applyeth it to a profane use.* ויתן ממנו על זר. Sep. *Kai os an dō ap' autou allogenou*. Vulg. *Et dederit ex eo alieno*; and so nearly all the versions. But the word *αλλογενής*, *alienus*, *stranger*, expresses not here the meaning of זר, which denotes every one, even an Israelite, not of the sacerdotal order. Hence Michaëlis paraphrases: "Wer ein gleiches oel nachmacht, oder einen, der nicht priester ist, damit salvet, &c." I have given the comma another turn, which fully expresses the meaning.

Ver. 34. *Bdellium.* שחלת. By our translators rendered "onycha," from the *ονυχια* of Sep. and *onycha* of Jerom. This is an odoriferous shell, called in German *see-nagel*, by us *nail-fish*, and by the French *ongle odorant*. In the shops it is called *blatta Byssantina*, and most interpreters think that it is the same with the Hebrew שחלת. I cannot, however, think that any *shell* is here meant. In Syr. שחל is to *drop*, to *distil*; and שחלת is a *tear*, *distillation*. I suspect then that the Heb. שחלת is some resinous substance, and as likely to be the *bdellium* as any other. It is here classed with other vegetable substances, with which it is not probable the nail-fish shell would be mingled. Rumphius's objection, that the *bdellium* was not used by the antients as an unguent, is of little force. It is not here used as an unguent, but as part of a perfume; and although it be not itself very odoriferous, it might be useful on another account, namely, to make the whole compound more inflammable. It is remarkable, that both Arabs have here לדנה, *ladanum*; viciously written *labdanum*. See C. R. on Gen. 37. 25.

Ver. 35. *A composition pure and sacred.* מכלה טהור קדש. By Arias Montanus rendered *salutem mundum sanctitas*: and some modern interpreters, among whom Michaëlis, think that מכלה here implies the addition of a sort of *salt*, namely *nitre*, or *saltpetre*; which, mingled with the other ingredients, gave a stronger and more extensive flavour to them. So Dathe:

"imprimis in initiatione ejus et consecratione, semper et טהור בן meminit. Jam vero non apparet, cur hoc fecerit, si בן *bafn* vel *scapum* notat, unamque cum labro partem effecerit. Quod si separata et distincta ejus pars fuit, utique *neceffe* erat, ut utriusque faceret mentionem." Dathe in loc.—Although I think not this reasoning altogether conclusive, it is so specious, that I have been led by it in my translation. Michaëlis, however, and Hezel keep firm to the antient *baf*; and I am not sure but they have reason.

* Even טהור admits the same meaning; nay, hardly admits any other, in such a position as the present.

adhibito sale puro et sancto. But there is no vestige of this additional salt in the antient versions; and, indeed, the construction will not admit of it. The most that can be inferred from the etymon of סֶלַח is, that the composition was made up, or granulated, in the manner of salt. The Sam. reading סֶלַח, corresponding with the preceding סֶלַח, is in favour of this idea.

C H A P. XXXI.

Ver. 6. *AND in the mind of every other intelligent man have I put wisdom.* וְלִבְכֶם כָּל חָכְמָה. Lit. "And in the mind (or heart) of every wise-minded man I have put wisdom." An apparent tautology; but which is read in all the copies without any variety, save that 2 mss. want לֵב after חָכְמָה; and such perhaps was the reading which Jerom and Saadiah had before them. I say perhaps, because both are wont to suppress pleonasm; and in many cases are unsure guides to lead us to the original reading. All the other ant. versions, down to Gr. Ven. read לֵב. Yet certainly the phrase is pleonastic, to say no more. Mr. Dimock would read וְלִבְכֶם כָּל חָכְמָה נָתַתִּי, and in their minds I have put all wisdom. But this, to me, appears too licentious an alteration, unsupported by any authority.—Houbigant has softened the tautology thus: *et omnibus, qui ingenio præditi sunt, dedi prudentiam*; and Dathe: *atque reliquis quoque artificibus peritiam contuli*.—The meaning of the Text, which I would leave entire, seems to be: "In the mind of every man, who is already wise, I will put more wisdom;" that is, will increase his natural ingenuity and skill, to devise and execute whatever is necessary. Moses chose among his people those whom he knew to be the best artificers, or perhaps those whom he favoured most; for, if Josephus may be believed, Bezaleel was either the son or grandson of Mary, the sister of Moses. The same Josephus says, that although Bezaleel, and his associates, were appointed artificers of the tabernacle, &c. by God, they were such men as the people, if left to themselves, would have selected for that purpose: *ὅς και το πλῆθος αὐ ἐπέλεξετο, τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐπ' αὐτῷ γενομένης* *.—Again he says, that Bezaleel and Eliab were deemed to be the chief artificers, inasmuch as they improved former inventions, and by the dint of their own genius invented things that were before unknown: *Τῶν γὰρ ἐνευρημένων τοῖς προτέροις αὐτοὶ προεβύληθησαν ἀμείνονα προτεργασασθαι, λαβὼν τε ἐπινοίαν ὡς πρότερον ἦγούσιν τὴν κατασκευὴν ἰκανώτατοι* †. In every language in the world, God is said to give those talents and endowments, whether natural or acquired, that distinguish one man from another; but in the eastern style, this language is bolder and more metaphorical than in our occidental regions.

Ver. 10. *The service-cloths for the service of the sanctuary.* The present Heb. text has only אֵת בְּגָדֵי הַשֵּׂרָד, rendered by Montanus *vestes ministerii*, and in our vulgar version *the cloths of service*; as if הַשֵּׂרָד were the same with הַשֵּׂרָת, which is here the reading of Sam. ‡—Which then is the true reading? and, if it be הַשֵּׂרָד, what is its meaning?—The antient versions

* Ant. l. 3. c. 6. n. 1.

† Ibid. c. 8. n. 4.

‡ But 8 Sam. mss. have הַשֵּׂרָד; which is the textual reading in the other three parallel places, ch. 35. 19. and 39. 1 and 41.

throw little light on the subject. The Septuagint omit the words entirely*, and seem not to have read the words in their copy any more than Jerom.—Syr. Onk. Tharg. Sam. version, Arab. Erp. Perf. and Gr. Ven. have *cloths of service*; consequently they read *השדרת*, or gave to *השדר* the same meaning.—Saadias certainly read *השדר*; and, I think, has well rendered it *הואב אלשי*: for, in the Sam. dialect, *שדרה* signifies a *variegated garment*; in Chald. *סרדן* are *embroidered*, or *craticulated, cloths*; and the radical meaning of *סרד* in Arab. is to *sew, weave*, and the like. This then is certainly a plausible interpretation; yet I am more inclined to think *השדרת* the better reading, and have followed it in my version. For the rest, I am persuaded that two words have been dropped out of the text; namely, *לשדרת בקדש*; which are in all the parallel places, and here in 7 Heb. mss. and in 4 copies of Chald. See De Rossi.—On this authority I have inserted them in my Translation. In my Explanatory Note, I have, perhaps, expressed myself too definitely with respect to the *cloths of service* here mentioned. It may be, that not only the wrappers, but the curtains, veils, and all cloths belonging to the tabernacle, are included in *השדרת* בנדי השדרת.

Ver. 18. *Written with his own finger.* I shall here content myself with presenting to my readers Rosenmüller's *scholium* on this passage. “Non videntur hæc verba ad litteram esse intelligenda, sed hoc tantum significare, *Deum dictasse Mosi istum legum complexum*; sive, *Deum in mandatis dedisse Mosi, ut leges duabus tabulis inscriberet.* Moses illa locutione sine dubio ideo usus est, ut indicaret illarum legum sanctitatem, atque ut adaugeret Israclitarum in illas reverentiam. Alii putant, ut Vogel ad Grotium hoc loco, Mosén hac locutione usum esse, non ut persuaderet populo, a Deo esse inscriptas has tabulas, sed ut accommodaret sese ad opinionem populi; qui, videns eum tabulas illas e Monte Sinai apportantem, credidisset, eas non arte humana, sed ab ipso Deo esse fabricatas atque inscriptas.”—We afterwards learn that these same tables, written on by the finger of God, were broken by Moses himself, when he came down from Mount Sinai, and were never more heard of. Surely the smallest fragment of them was as worthy of being preserved in the ark as the urn of manna, or Aaron's rod. A single word, or letter, written by the hand of God, and on tables wrought by the hand of God, would have been the most rare and precious of all sacred things. Of the second tables, the writing only was God's; the workmanship Moses's.

C H A P. XXXII.

Ver. 4. *IN a mould.* *בחרט*. Various rendered by the antients. Sep. and Gr. Ven. *עפ קדש*. Vulg. *opere fusorio*. Syr. *בחרטא*, in a *model*. Sam. Vers. *במרי*; by Castell rendered *stylo*, but which I believe to have the same meaning as Syr. See the Chald. root *סרד*. Onk. *בחרטא*, which, whether well rendered by Buxtorf in *stylo*, I doubt. Tharg. *במחרטא*, not less ambiguous than the former. Saad. *בקרבל*; and Erp. *פי חלקבל*; both denoting a *model* or *frame*. Perf. *דר בחרטא*, in a *crucible*, or *melting-pot*: a most apt version, if *חרט* could bear such a meaning. As the word occurs, in any form, but four times in the whole Bible, its

* I once suspected that they had designedly omitted them, or that their text wanted the copulative before the second *ואת*; which is the reading of 3 Sam. mss. In this supposition they omit nothing, but only suppress the pleonastic *ואת* בחרט. The same may be said of Jerom's version,

meaning is not easily determined. In Isaiah, 8. 1. its signification is in some measure fixed by the context; yet not so precisely as to exclude all doubt. In Sept. it is rendered *γραφίδις*; by Jerom *stylo*; and by our English translators a *pen* *. But it is my opinion that none of these terms denote the meaning of the original. The Syr. translator seems to have happily rendered it *בכתבא דאנשא*, very properly translated *humano scribendi more*. "Take a book," says he, "and write in it in common writing." This I take to be the real meaning of the word in Isaiah. It does not then denote the instrument used in writing, but the *form or character* of the writing; and in this sense we shall see how it comes in to support the meaning which I have given to the word in Exodus. In Isaiah, 3. 22. *חרטים* is, in our common version, rendered *crisping-pins*; by Purver *pockets*; and by Lowth and Dodson *little purses*. In 2 K. 5. 23. the same word is, in our common version, rendered *bags*; but by Bate *cases*, which I take to be the better rendering. Jerom, indeed, has *saccis*; and Tharg. and Syr. have terms equivalent; but Greek and Arab. have *βυζαντες*, and *תלסין*, *baskets*; and these were certainly more proper for carrying two talents of silver (169,724 pounds), than two bags of any sort. May not the *חרטים* of Isaiah, 3. 22. be something of the same kind—a work-basket for example; or a basket to hold trinkets?—In any case, we may infer from these places that *חרט* was not a *style*, but some vessel of capacity, fit for the reception of something else. If we apply this to the passage of Exodus, it will appear, I think, that *חרט* must mean either the vessel in which the gold was melted, or the mould in which it was fashioned. I have preferred the latter meaning for the following reasons. First, It was so understood by Syr. and both Arabs, between whom there could be no collusion. Secondly, In the Sam. dialect, *חרטה* signifies a *form, model*: "God created all things without a model, *בלי חרטה*." Thirdly, the common rendering, a *graving-tool*, is inept; for, how could he fashion the gold with a graving-tool before it was fused?—Hence Le Clerc and Dathe, who retain the term, are obliged to use a *hysteron-proteron* to make sense of the passage: *et formavit illud celo, postquam vitulum fustum ex eo fecerat*. Somewhat better Michaelis: "machte mit dem griffel eine *zeichnung*," *he made a model with a graving-tool or style* †. But in the text is either no *style* or no *model*: *model*, then, appears to be the more eligible term. I cannot, however, but confess, that the Persic version is very plausible: *he put it into the crucible*: agreeably to what Aaron himself says, ver. 24, in his own excuse: "I threw them into the fire, and out came that calf."—This is expressly against the interpretation of Hezel, adopted by Rosenmüller, who imagined that the calf was made of wood, and only covered over with gold ‡.—They were, probably, led to this explanation here, from the difficulty of explaining ver. 20.

Ver. 5. *When Aaron saw this.* *ורא אהרן*. The Syrian translator seems to have read *ורא*: "And Aaron was afraid:" which Houbigant prefers to the present reading. This might, in-

* Very improperly, for pens were not then used in writing; nor are they used at this day in those countries, reeds supply their place; but in the days of Isaiah, the implement of writing was a *stylus*, or *pin*. † So in his German Version: but he afterwards was inclined to think that *frame*, or *model*, was the proper rendering of *חרט*.

‡ "Er bildete (schnitzte) es (das götzenbild) mit einem meißel, und er machte es (nemlich das, was er bereits aus holz geschnitzt hatte) zu einem kalb (stier) des gießens.—Er überzog das aus holz geschnitzte götzenbild mit einem guss von gold."

deed, serve in some sort to alleviate the criminal condescension of Aaron; but as all the other interpreters read וַיֵּרָא , and as there is no variety of lection in the copies of either the Heb. or Sam. text, I see no reason for departing from the present reading. Houbigant's objection, "*cum præsertim non addatur quid videat Aaron,*" is of no force, as it is not uncommon to find the verb וַיֵּרָא without its objective case.

Ver. 8. *Which thou commandedst them.* אָמַר צִוִּיתָם . The Masoretes have pointed צִוִּיתָם , as if it were in the 1 p. sing.; and 18 mss. with the ant. edition of Soncino, have צִוִּיתָם full *: yet I am persuaded that we ought to read in the second person, because that is the uniform reading of all the copies of Sam. in which the distinguishing *jod* is never suppressed—because the Sam. version follows that reading—because it was the reading of Sep. and Vulg. and perhaps that of Syr. and Onk.—and because it better accords with the context, *Thou hast brought—thou hast commanded.*

Ver. 19: *So hot was his anger, &c.* It is not easy to account for this conduct of Moses, who is elsewhere declared to be the mildest of men. If the tables which he had in his hands were really the workmanship of God, and written on by the finger of God, as is expressly said ver. 16. we can hardly conceive how any provocation, on the part of the people, could induce him to break in pieces so rare a monument and so sacred a trust. We are told by interpreters, that it was the sudden effect of a warm, pious, holy zeal. That it was warm, it must be allowed; but how it could be pious or holy, one is at a loss to perceive. I mean, still, in the supposition that the tables were the manufacture of God. We must, then, either confess that Moses here, with all his mildness, piety, and zeal, committed a rash and unwarrantable action, or allow that neither the tables nor the writing on them were literally the handy-work of God. This is, indeed, what our more modern commentators seem willing to grant. So Rosenmüller, after thus rendering the words of the text: *Et tabule erant opus Dei, et scriptura erat scriptura Dei, insculpta tabulis,* adds: "*Quorum verborum sensus videtur esse hic: tam tabulas ipsas earumque formam, quam earum inscribendarum rationem, provenisse ex divina institutione, qua usus fuit Moses.*"

Ver. 20. It is asked how Moses could beat gold to a powder; and various answers have been given. There are who think that it was done by some chymical operation, known in those days, but lost afterwards. We know that gold is dissolved in *aqua-regis*; and that the solution, precipitated by volatile alkali, produces a gold dust, *aurum fulminans*; but whether this process were known to Moses, or to the Hebrews of any other period, it is at least very doubtful. Aben Ezra indeed tells us, as a thing unquestionable, that gold may be turned into powder by a mixture of certain herbs; and that after the operation it is not reconver-
tible into gold: and Emanuel Sa professes to have seen an alchymist of his day reduce gold into dust: but both these testimonies have been strongly suspected; and in the latter case, perhaps, the alchymist imposed on the jesuit. Michaëlis and other modern critics imagined that the calf was made of gilt wood, and consequently might easily be burnt to ashes: but this, to me, appears totally repugnant to the text of Scripture, as has been already observed.

* The words in both, when unpointed, are ambiguous; but De Rossi found 16 Chald. mss. and 10 printed editions, which had אָמַרְתָּם in the first person: and so read both Arabs, Pers. and Gr. Ven. The reader will balance the authorities, and judge for himself, as I have done.

I am, therefore, inclined to think, with Syr. Onk. and both Arabs, that the mass of gold was filed down by a file, or some such instrument.—Josephus says, that Solomon's horsemen, among other splendid decorations, had their fine long hair daily powdered with such filings *. Of this indeed there is no mention in the present Hebrew volumes; but as they tell us that gold was uncommonly *plenteous* in the days of Solomon, it is nowise improbable that his cavalry might use its filings for the decoration of their persons. At any rate, Josephus must have alluded to some such oriental custom.

Ver. 25. *When Moses saw that the people were in disarray.* The Hebrew word פָּרַד is commonly rendered *naked* †; and some word is supposed to be understood, such as *ear-rings—arms—the grace of God, &c.* But there is no need of any supplement; the meaning of פָּרַד is clear from the context, and from other passages of Scripture, and it is well rendered by Sep. διασκαδῶσαι ‡. The people were in a *dissipated, dissolute, disorderly* state; and therefore in a condition to be attacked with advantage; for the words, which in our common version are rendered “unto their shame among their enemies,” לשמור בקסדם, or, as much better the Sam. copy, לשמו בקסדם, are, in my opinion, grossly mistranslated. The word שָׁמַן occurs but here and in Job, 4. 12. where it has been generally rendered *a little, paucillum*; but which, I am persuaded, is not its meaning §. I am persuaded, with Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe, that we are to look for the radical signification of the word in the Arabic سَمَن, *to smite suddenly*; the same with the Heb. שָׁם, from which our *smite* || may be derived, as the German *schmeissen* from שָׁמַן. The Greek translators seem to have read לשמור, as they render επιχαδῶσαι ¶ τοῖς ὑπεροχούσις αὐτῶν, *to the joy, or derision, of their adversaries*: yet they may have read as we do, and guessed the best they could at the meaning of an uncommon word. In fact, their version is essentially the same with that which I have adopted; for a people that may be easily smitten by the assailants, must be an object of joy, or derision, to these assailants. I will now give Michaëlis's version of the whole verse: “Mose sahe nun das volk vom gesetz losgerissen (denn Aharon selbst hatte sie losgemacht), und dass sie vor jedem, der wider eis aufstünde, würden fliehen müssen.”—Dathe: *Cum autem Moses populum passim dissolutum videret, quia iussu Aaronis festum celebrabat, et facile cedi posse, si quis eum aggrederetur.*—The first and last commas are rightly and elegantly rendered; but the second is an unnecessary paraphrase.

Ver. 29. *And Moses said, To-day ye have initiated yourselves, &c.* Lit. *To-day your hands have been filled.*—The construction of this verse makes it ambiguous. The word מלא may be either the second person pl. imperative, or the third person pl. of the præterite of both the active and passive voices. The Masoretes have pointed it in the first acceptation, and have been followed by most moderns, who, to reconcile the text with itself, put the preceding אָמַר in the pluperfect tense. So our English Version: “For Moses had said, Consecrate yourselves “to-day to the Lord, &c.” And Delgado thinks it necessary, moreover, to put the 8th verse in a parenthesis, as an interruption in the speech of Moses. But certainly all this is

* Πηγμα δὲ χρυσίου (αὐτὸ χρυσίου) καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτῶν ἐπισχέον τοῖς νομαῖς. Ant. l. viii. c. 7. n. 3. p. 448.

† From the Vulg. *nudatus*.

‡ So also Theod.: οὗτοι διασκαδασμένοι ἐστί.

§ See the Rem. on that

place. || Sax. *smitan*; Belg. *smeten*; from the same root is our *smith*, the German *schmid*, and the Belgic

said. ¶ Or perhaps εἰς χαδῶσαι in two words.

very awkward, and is easily amended by making מלא the pret. of *Niphal*, and ירבו * its nominative: *Et dixit Moses: Impletæ sunt manus vestræ hodie.*—At first sight, one would be apt to think that the Septuagint and Jerom read in their copies מלאהם, as they render *ἐπληρώσατε τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν, consecratis manus vestras*: but I believe they read as the present text, considered מלא as a passive, but gave another turn to the sentence, without in the smallest degree changing its meaning; for, *ye have filled or consecrated your bands, and your bands have been filled or consecrated*, are perfectly homologous.

Ver. 32. "Our translation," says Secker, "as it is pointed, doth not answer the Hebrew; and if the comma after *wilt* be omitted, the sense is imperfect. Sam. and Sep. add שׁוּ; but an ellipsis is usual in this form of speech. See 1 Sam. 12. 14; Luke, 13. 9."—He thinks the verse might be translated thus: "Wilt thou now forgive their sins? If not, &c." A very ingenious emendation; but as שׁוּ is in the Sam. text, and as the Septuagint either read it in their copy, or supplied it, I see no reason why we should not follow them. Jerom supplies the omission thus: "Aut demitte eis hanc noxam; aut, si non facis, dele, &c." Dathe: "Quod si ei condonaveris, felicem me existimabo; sin minus, dele me e catalogo viventium."

CHAP. XXXIII.

Ver. 7. *MOSES took his tent.* In the text there is only דודו, *the tent*; but Sep. and Syr. seem to have read דודו, *his own tent*; and this reading I have followed in my Version. Some commentators, however, think that, even before the construction of the Tabernacle, the Israelites had a public tent, dedicated to religion, which tent is here to be understood. But if this were the case, it is odd that no mention of it is ever made before.—Perhaps we might render *a tent*, as it is certain that the prefix ה is not always a definitive article: yet still I think it more probable that it was the special tent of Moses †.

Ver. 11. *Now the Lord talked with Moses, as a man talketh with his friend.* From this and other expressions, in the following verses, the reader may form a tolerable idea of the extravagance of oriental hyperbolé; and if he understand German, he will find in Herder's *Spirit of Hebrew Poesy* a beautiful illustration of this whole chapter.

Ver. 12. *I know thee by name.* ידעתיך בשם. Well rendered by Sep. *οἶδα σε παρὰ πάντας, I know thee above all others*; i. e. Thou art a distinguished favourite ‡.

Ver. 13. *Make known to me thy purposes.* The present Heb. text has דעוני את דרכך *show me thy way*; but I believe the true reading to be דרכיך, which is that of Sam. and above 20 mss. and of Saadiah and the Perfic translator; and I take the meaning of דרכי here to be *purposes, designs, ways of acting*. The Septuagint have *φανερώτω μοι σκοπούς*; and Vulg. *ostende*

* Which is the reading of Sam. 13 mss. Sep. Syr. Vulg. and one of De Rossi's Chald. mss. † Michaëlis argues thus. In ver. 8. it is said that Moses went out of the camp to the tent in question; therefore his tent must still have been in the camp. But this by no means follows: he returned from his own tent from time to time, to impart to the people the divine injunctions; but it is nowhere said that he remained in the camp any longer than his commissions were delivered.

‡ "Locutio sumpta a principibus, qui non omnes suos cives, sed paucos duntaxat norunt, qui ad interiorem familiaritatem admitti, et apud eos gratiosi esse solent." Rosenmüller in loc.

nihil faciem tuam : yet it is probable that they had not different readings before them, but only metaphrased.

Ver. 18. *Shew me then thy glory.* דרמני נא את כבוד. Michaëlis is of opinion that כבוד here means the *heart*, as it does in the Arabic, and that *heart* is equivalent to *self*, as if Moses said : " Shew me ~~thy~~ *very self*, thine own essence." So, indeed, the Septuagint have here rendered ἐφάνιστον μοι σεαυτον, the same words which they had before employed in ver. 13*. I prefer the common meaning of כבוד, with all the other ant. translators, down to Gr. Ven. which has literally, yet elegantly, δειξον μοι δε την δειξαν σου.

I cannot quit this chapter without inserting here the substance of some observations made on it by Delgado. He finds the explication of the chapter a very difficult task : " First, on " account of the mysterious subject thereof ;" which he passes over " as almost unintelligible." . . . " The second difficulty consists in the transposition of sentences, which makes this " chapter almost unintelligible, in point of succession of events ; for the first three verses God " spoke to Moses while he was on the mountain : then Scripture interrupts the narrative, " ver. 4, to inform us what the people did in consequence of what God told him in ver. 3, " in which a reason is assigned for their behaviour in ver. 4, as if he had been down from the " mountain to tell it them. Ver. 6 follows close to ver. 4 ; and what is narrated in ver. 7, to " the end of ver. 11, must refer to what happened after Moses came down the last time. In " ver. 12, the dialogue between God and Moses is resumed ; and Moses gives an answer to " God's last speech in ver. 2 and ver. 5 ; and the discourse is carried on to the 3d verse in " the following chapter ; so that the transitions are numerous and perplexed."—These are the reflections of a learned Jew upon his own Scriptures ; but I apprehend they are in a great measure founded on a mistake, namely, that Moses was on Mount Sinai when God spoke to him in ver. 1, or indeed in any other part of this chapter. Verses 8—11 are indeed a sort of interruption of the narrative : but such interruptions are very frequent in the Hebrew Scriptures. The historian having once mentioned the council-tent, very naturally adds what is contained in the fore said verses before he proceeds. I trust that the transpositions complained of by Delgado disappear in my Version.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Ver. 7. *ACQUITTING even him who is not innocent.* ונקד לא ינקד ; by Montanus rendered *purificando non purificabit* ; and by our last English translators, " And that will by no means " clear the guilty†." The Septuagint took it in the same sense, και ου καθαριζει τον ενοχον ; and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. Erp. and Perf.—The Syr. and Saad. may also be understood in

* From this it might be suspected that they read כבוד in both places ; but this is very uncertain. † Cov. : " Before whom there is no man innocent."—Mat. : " For there is no man innocent before thee ;" after Vulg.—Bish. : " And not leaving one innocent."—Gen. : " Not making the wicked innocent."—Bate : " But who will not wholly " clear."—Purver : " However not at all acquitting."—Delgado : " But will not totally clear the guilty."—More literally Ainsworth : " And that will not clearing clear the guilty."—Similar to one or other of these is every foreign version, whether Latin or vernacular. See Poole's Synops. the

the same sense. Gr. Ven. is singular: *καὶ αἰσῶς οὐκ αἰσῶσθαι ἔσται*, and the innocent shall not be deemed innocent. He understood the words in their proper sense, but thought that נָקָה related to the innocent man, not to God. Nay, so seems Jerom to have done, who thus paraphrases: *Nullusque apud te per se innocens est*: an unwarrantable version on two accounts; first, because it gives a false nominative to נָקָה; and secondly, because it puts the words in the mouth of Moses, as is done throughout the whole verse.—There is a various reading in the Sam. copy, which changes the meaning: it has לוֹ instead of לֵא; and this forms a consentaneous meaning: *And to, or with, him, the innocent will be accounted innocent*. Yet I am persuaded it is not the genuine reading, and suspect that an ה has been dropped out of the Samaritan text, which had originally לֵא written full. We must then be contented with the present reading, and try to make it congruous; for every version that I have seen is harsh, unanalogous, and discordant; that of De Dieu, adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller, not excepted*. For, granting that נָקָה signifies *perdere*, which I very much question†, where is there an example of its also signifying *impius* in any oriental dialect‡?

I am ever loth to wrest a word to a meaning which it seemingly cannot bear; and therefore I here take נָקָה in its common and well-known acceptation. Then, I think, it will be readily allowed, that נָקָה is in the same participial, or gerundive form, as נָצַר and נִשְׁמָא which precede, and פָּקַד that follows; and that יָנָקָה has a similar signification. This being granted, I consider the words נָקָה לֹא יָנָקָה as equivalent to נָקָה לֹא יָנָקָה. Every novice in Hebrew grammar knows that אֲשֶׁר is often elegantly suppressed in similar phrases. I shall only quote a few from the Psalms, in which this *ellipsis* is frequent. Psalm 33. 12. הָעָם בָּחַר, *The people whom he chose*. 91. 6. מִחוּץ יִקָּח יוֹמָם, *From the arrow which flieth by day*. 118. 24. אֲבָן סָאסוּ הַבְּנִיִּים, *The stone which the builders rejected*. And with the negative לֹא, as here, Psalm 18. 44. עַם לֹא יָדַעְתִּי, *A people whom I knew not*. 52. 9. הַנָּכַר לֹא יָשַׁם, *The man who putteth not*. 81. 6. שִׁפְתִּי לֹא יָדַעְתִּי, *A tongue which I knew not*.—And, what is remarkable, our own language often admits a similar mode of phrasing; as, in the last example, we might say, *He spoke a tongue I knew not: He is a man I never saw: It is a book I have not read*: and so with regard to the other personal pronouns, both singular and plural. This *ellipsis* being admitted, and the vowel-points changed, the literal version will be *mundans eum, qui non mundus est*; or, as I have rendered in my Version, *acquitting him even who is not altogether innocent*. If any one like not this version, let him choose or frame another for himself.

Ver. 21. *In seed-time even, and in harvest, shalt thou rest*.—Delgado would correct our common version thus; “From earing and from reaping thou shalt rest;” with the following note; “It doth not refer to the seasons; for if so, in fruit-time and in winter, we should be

* “Plerique interpretes verba Textus vertere solent non impunè demittet impium. Rectè quidem quoad sententiam, atque etiam verbi נָקָה significationem; sed non satis aptè quoad contextum, aut reliqua Dei attributa hic laudata. . . . Sed נָקָה etiam significat *vastare, perdere*; quæ notio, misericordiam Dei egregiè pingens, contextui aptissima videtur.” Dathe; who renders *Non prorsus perdit impium*, and joins it to what follows. † The example quoted from Zachariah, 5. 3. is very doubtful, as I shall shew in my Rem. on that place; which the Syr. translator, I think, has very properly rendered.

‡ It is well remarked by Secker that “נָקָה nowhere occurs as a noun; nor does נָקִי or נָקִיָּה ever signify a person who deserves to be punished, and is not; but one who is free from guilt, or exempted from punishment; or, as 1 K. 15. 26. *free from obligation*. See also Exod. 21. 19; Num. 5. 31; Deut. 5. 11; Job, 9. 28.”

"dispensed from keeping the sabbath; which is absurd: but it means, that in that day we must refrain from those labours, and such like: an *et cetera* being meant, which is lacking in the Hebrew, according to the Scripture style, though &c. is common in the Rabbinical writings."—I cannot but wonder at this remark. The text is בחרש ובקציר תשבת; whereas, to have the meaning given to it by this translator, it should be מחרש ומקציר; as in Gen. 2. 3. שבת מכל מאבתו; and Exod. 5. 5. השבתם אתם מסבלתם. All the antient interpreters* concur in rendering the comma; but none has better expressed the sense than Saadias: *תתי תסבת פי וקת אחרת אלחצאר, keep the sabbath even in the time of ploughing and of reaping.* The meaning of the precept evidently is, that the sabbath should be strictly observed even in the busiest times of the year, the seed-time and the harvest; which includes the vintage and fruit-gathering. Nor was this a hard injunction in Judæa, where the weather, during those seasons, is constantly fine and favourable. In other climates the obligation would often be attended with serious consequences.

Ver. 23. *Three times in the year shall all your male children appear before the Lord.* As we are not told at what age the males were obliged to appear, we are at liberty to guess that it might be from the age of twenty years upwards; yet, even with this modification, to draw together, thrice every year, so many men from their domestic avocations, might seem to be no good political economy. Hence the late Mr. Street thought that the words might be thus rendered: "At three distinct seasons may be seen all the males before the Lord;" so that but one-third of them, at a time, were called together: but I think the text will not bear this meaning. It is certain that very great multitudes may be assembled in those countries, where travellers live on little, and bring along with them all that is necessary during their stay at the place of meeting, and for their journey to and from it. From Josephus we learn, that not less than 1,100,000 men perished at the siege of Jerusalem: and to obviate the objection, how could so many be assembled? he adds, that at a former paschal solemnity, a census had been made by the high-priests, at the desire of the pro-consul *Cestius*; and that the number of men present were 2,700,000, the unclean and strangers not included†.—I am apt to think that the number is exaggerated; but were we to reduce it one-half, it would be still a great number. But this was at a paschal solemnity, the greatest among the Hebrew people; and at that period the Jews seem to have been stricter observers of their ritual laws than their predecessors before the Captivity.—For the rest, I find not a single instance of the observation of this Mosaic precept, not even in the reign of the pious David, or of the wise Solomon: nor, indeed, do we read of the great *Phasah* itself being kept but once by King Josiah; 2 K. 23. 21. and 2 Chron. 35. 1.—It is true we may conclude from the context that it had been

* Sep. τῶ σπέρμῃ καὶ τῶ ἀμῆτῳ—Vulg. *Die septimo cessabis arare et metere*—Onk. בורחא וקצירא; and so equivalently Sym. Erp. Perf. and Gr. Ven.: ἐν ἀροτῇ καὶ ἀμῆτῳ ἀναπαύσεις.

† Ὅτι δὲ ἐχθροὶ τοσούτοις ἢ πόλιν, ἔχον ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ Κεστίῳ συναριθμηθέντων, ὅς . . . παρεκάλεσε τὰς ἀρχιερεῖς, ὥπως δυνατόν εἴη, τὸν πλεόντα ἐξαριθμῆσθαι: οἱ δὲ, ἐνστασις ἑορτῆς (Πασχα καλεῖται) καθ' ἣν θύοι μὲν ἀπὸ ἑννατῆς ὥρας μεχρὶ ἑνδεκατῆς . . . τῶν μὲν οὖν θυμάτων ἑκατοὶ πεντε μυριάδας προσήμασαν, πρὸς δὲ ἑξακισχίλια καὶ πεντακοσία γίνονται ἄνδρων, ἢ ἑκάστη δέκα θάυτομονας ἔαμεν, ΜΥΡΙΑΔΕΣ ἙΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΚΟΣΙΑΙ, καθάρων ἀπάντων καὶ ἁγίων. De Bell. Jud. l. vi. c. 9. n. 3. p. 399.

observed in prior times, although not with such solemnity*; yet it is very odd that not one instance of it is recorded in the Hebrew annals, from the entrance of the Israelites into the land of Chanaan, save once by Jothuah at Gilgal, after the passage of the Jordan. See Josh. 5. 10.—Is it not strange that Solomon, who offered so many thousands of victims, is never said to have kept either the paschal festival, or any of the other two festivals here mentioned?

Ver. 28. *And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, ten articles.* The original is: וכתב לע הלכות את דברי חברית עשרות הדברים. The question is, what is the nominative to כתב? The context leads us to imagine that it was Moses who wrote, as he is desired to do in ver. 27.; in which case, the writing must be the precepts recorded from ver. 12 to 26 inclusively: and this is the opinion of Houbigant †. The Septuagint version seems to favour this interpretation: Και εγραψεν επι των πλακων τα ρηματα ταυτα της διαθηκης, τους δεκα λογους. The word ταυτα is however wanting in the Oxford ms. in Copt. and the old Ital. as quoted by Auslin. The order of Compl. is, Και εγραψε τα ρηματα ταυτα επι των πλακων της διαθηκης, τους δεκα λογους. If this were the genuine reading of the Septuagint, one would think that they meant to say that the above precepts were written on the back of the same tables which contained the Decalogue; to which circumstance the author of the Apocalypse is by some thought to allude, when, ch. 5. 1. he speaks of a book written “within and “on the back-side,” as our common Version renders ενωθεν και οπισθεν ‡. I know that Grotius and others consider this as a mistranslation, and join και οπισθεν το κατασφραγισμενον §. But to me they appear to be in the wrong; and I think, with Vitranga, that a similar passage in Ezechiel, which the Revelation-writer had evidently in view, decides the question: “He “spread it (the volume) before me, (says the prophet,) and it was written on the face and “on the back,” פנים ואחור. Ezck. 2. 10.—But to return to our present text. The Arabic translator Saadias certainly considered Moses as the nominative to wrote, as he has כתב לה, et scripsit sibi.—The other versions are equally ambiguous with the Hebrew; save that the Thargumists so paraphrase it as to make it appear that they considered the Lord as the nominative. And indeed there are some not weak arguments for that supposition; for, in the first place, the words עשרת הדברים, in the parallel place of Deuteronomy, 10. 4. are evidently

* From these words, “Such another Phasah had not been celebrated from the days of the judges, who judged Israel, nor in all the days of the kings of Israel, or of the kings of Judah.” 2 K. 23. 22. See also 2 Chron. 35. 18.
† “Sunt hoc versu verba fœderis eadem de quibus dicitur ver. 27. verba hæc, in quibus ipse verbi docet Deus se “fancire fœdus cum Mose et cum Israel. Atque illa verba hæc ver. 27 de iis præceptis enuntiantur, quæ dat Mose “Deus a ver. 12. usque ad ver. 27. Cum igitur mandet Mose Deus, ut verba hæc in tabulis describat, consecrarium est, ut eadem illa verba Moses in tabulis exararit, utque adeo וכתב et scripsit de Mose scribente efferatur; denique ut “Moses in tabulis scripserit, non Decalogum, de quo nihil quidquam habent præcepta mox memorata, sed illa ipsa “præcepta, quæ ad numerum decem vocare sic possis. Nam primum præceptum erit, de fœdere non fanciendo cum “gentibus Chanaan—secundum, de non colendis Diis alienis—tertium, de paschate celebrando—quartum, de offerendis “Deo primogenitis—quintum, de sabbato custodiendo—sextum, septimum, et octavum, de tribus festis per annum celebrandis—nonum, de fermento a victimis removendo—decimum, de non coquendo hædo in adipe matris.”

‡ Other copies have ενωθεν; and so Vulg. intus et foris.

§ So Wakefield: “A book written within, and “sealed on the back.”

spoken of the Decalogue, or ten commandments, which were written on the two tables of stone; and, according to the narration there, written by the hand of God, as they were on the former tables. Secondly, If the *יָכַתב* in Exodus relate not to God, it is nowhere else said in that book that he wrote the Decalogue on the new tables prepared by Moses; which, however, we are taught to expect from the command contained in the first verse of the chapter, compared with Deut. 10. 1—4. Hence Houbigant was inclined to think that something had dropped out of the text, and would fill it up thus: "יָכַתב על הלוחות אֵת דְּבַר הַבְּרִית - וַיִּכְתֹּב" (דדה), "And he [Moses] wrote on the tables the words of the [above] covenant; but the Lord wrote the Decalogue." But as there is no vestige of such an addition in either of the texts, or in any of the versions, it is not, in my opinion, readily to be admitted.

Mosi modern interpreters supply the word *דדה*, the Lord. So Michaëlis: "*Er muß hier auf Gott gehen, weil ver. 1. Gott gesagt hatte, er wolle selbst die zehen Gebote auf die neuen von Mose zubereiteten Tafeln schreiben.*"—So also Hezel; and Dathe, who thus paraphrases: "*Atque tabulis illis inscriptæ erant conditiones harum promissionum, nempe decem præcepta.*"—I chose, in my version, to imitate the ambiguity of the original, as I was then, and still am, in doubt about the genuine meaning*.

Ver. 29. *He knew not that the skin of his face had become resplendent.* The Hebrew is, *לֹא יָדַע* כי קרן עור פָּנָיו; by Sep. rendered *οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι δαδῶσεν αὐτῷ ἡ σὺν τῷ χρωματός (or χρωτός) τῷ προσώπου αὐτοῦ*; by Jerom, *ignorabat quod cornuta esset facies sua*; which he tells us he had from Aquila, although the Greek of Aquila be lost. Hence the idea of painting Moses *horned*. But all the other translators understood the word קרן metaphorically: even the very literal Gr. Ven. has *ελαμψε*.

Ver. 33. *And when he had done speaking to them, he put a veil upon his face.* וַיִּכְסֵּה מֹשֶׁה מַסְכָּה אָתָּה וַיְהִי עַל פָּנָיו מִסַּח.—Some modern interpreters imagine that there is here a *hysteron-proteron*, and that the words should be rendered, as in our common version, "And till Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face;" or, as Dathe, *Quando Moses ad eos loquebatur, velamen faciei suæ imposuit*. They ground this mode of rendering chiefly on the authority of St. Paul, 2 Cor. 3. 13. who says: *Καὶ οὕτως καθάπερ Μωϋσῆς ἐτίθει καλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ προσωπὸν αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀνιέναι τοὺς ὄψους Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου †*. But Paul is here acting not the part of an interpreter or of an historian, but that of a mere allegorist. It was

* Archbishop Secker's M.S. note on the place is in substance as follows: "These words (in ver. 27.) cannot mean the Commandments, but the words from ver. 10 to 26. . . One should then think that *he* who wrote in the next verse was Moses, who is commanded to write in this; and that the words of the covenant which he wrote, are those of the covenant in this chapter, and which might easily be divided into ten parts. . . Or, the ten commandments might be supposed a gloss; but *ὁ*, Syr. Chald. and Vulg. have it: and probably it means the second edition of the Ten Commandments, and that *He* means God; who saith, ver. 1. that he will write them again: and Moses saith, Deut. 4. 13. and 10. 4. that God did write them again. The Ten Commandments, Deut. 9. 9, 11. are called the tables of the covenant." † I have not rendered these words, because I am as yet doubtful how I should render them. Our public version has: "And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." But Wakefield thus: "And are not like Moses, who used to put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel might not at all look upon that which is now

"no more."

enough for his purpose that it is said in Exod. 34. 30. that when the children of Israel saw the splendour of Moses's countenance, they were afraid to approach him. Approach him, however, they did, at his own desire: and Moses talked with them; during which talk it is not said that he veiled his face. But verses 34 and 35 (say Dathie and others) explain this, and put it beyond all doubt that Moses put on his veil as often as he spoke to the people. I am of a very different opinion, and think that it is clear from these very verses, as well as from ver. 33, that his face remained unveiled all the time in which he delivered to the people his divine oracles, and that it was covered only in common conversation. Not one of the ancient interpreters thought of rendering ver. 33 in any other sense. Sep. *Και επειδη κατεπαυσε [Μωυσης] λαλουν προς αυτους, επεθηκεν επι το προσωπον αυτου καλυμμα.*—Vulg. *Impletisque sermonibus, posuit velamen super faciem suam.* So equivalently all the other versions.—With these agree the most learned Jewish interpreters, whose opinion is well represented by Delgado *. The objections from ver. 34 and 35 are perfectly removed in my version. It is but doing justice to Houbigant to say, that he had well rendered the whole passage before me †.

C H A P. XXXV.

Ver. 3. *YOU may not even kindle fires.* *לֹא תִבְעֵרוּ אֵשׁ.* The severity of this prohibition in so cold a country as Judæa in winter is, has given rise to suspicions that the text has been altered.—The late Mr. S. Street imagined that the true reading may have been *לֹא תִבְעֵרוּ אִשׁ*; and, pointing after *תִבְעֵרוּ*, would render the precept thus: "Ye shall not behave like brutes: I will dwell in all your habitations on the sabbath-day."—"In the heathen religious rites," adds he, "many impure and indecent, and even foolish and *brutish* ceremonies were performed. This accounts for the reason of the precept."—That *בֶּעַר* sometimes signifies a *brutish* fellow (hence the word *boor*) is questionless; but I very much question if it can have that signification here. The reading *אֵשׁ* has no authority but a rasure after *אֵשׁ* in one of Kennicott's mss.; and it is more probable that the letter erased was *ה* than *ב*. All the antients, down to Gr. Ven. read as we now do. But if it were forbidden to kindle fire on

* "By the addition of the word *till*," says he, "in the beginning of this verse, the English translator plainly discovered that he did not understand the meaning of this passage. The use of this veil was to cover from the people the *sebachim*, or glory, that was on Moses's face: but *that* he did not dare to do while he was rehearsing the Lord's words to them; for that glory was his credentials, as if the Lord was speaking to them through his mouth: so that Moses could not put on the veil till he had done speaking to them, which is quite opposite to the meaning which the English translator gives to this passage, and which is certainly erroneous. And here Moses, to remove their fears, accosted them by degrees; first Aaron, then the princes, and then the people; and delivered to them the Lord's word, without any veil."—Nothing can be better said. † "Et cum Moses finem faciebat loquendi, ponebat velamen

super vultum suum. Sed cum Moses Dominum adibat, ut cum eo loqueretur, auferbat velamen, donec ab eo degrederetur; deinde, egressus, filiis Israel referebat ea, quæ sibi Dominus mandarat, filiis Israel faciem ejus rutilantem videntibus: qui postea velamen in vultum referebat, donec iret, ut cum Domino colloqueretur."—To the same purport, more latterly Michaëlis, and Hezel, whose short note I shall here subjoin. "Moses bedeckte sein Angesicht nicht wenn er mit Gott redete; auch nicht, wenn er an Gottes statt dem volk einen vortrag zu thun hatte, um den Israeliten dadurch zu zeigen, daß ihn wirklich ein höheres wesen gesandt habe, und seinem vortrag ansehen zu verschaffen. Er bedeckte es aber, wenn er ausgeredet hatte."

the sabbath-day, how were the sacrifices to be offered? I answer, that the sacrifices are here out of the question; it is only in private dwelling-houses that the kindling of fires is forbidden, and perhaps forbidden only for the purposes of cookery; which was not absolutely necessary, as victuals might be cooked the day before. I remember the time when, among the stricter Presbyterians of Scotland, nothing was cooked on Sunday, nor even a pot of water boiled for the purpose of making tea. It is probable that the Mosaiical precept did not prohibit the lighting of fire in very cold weather. At any rate it was a local precept, which in many climates would have been highly unreasonable.—It is not unworthy of remark, that, at the end of this verse, all the copies of Sep. which I have seen have *εγω Κυριος*; and so the Coptic version.

Ver. 8. From the beginning of this ver. to the end of ver. 19, very different from the arrangement of the Heb. and Sam. texts is that of Sep. in all the editions, except the Complutensian. Whether its editors adapted their mss. to the Hebrew order, or found that order in some of their mss. it is yet uncertain. Perhaps Dr. Holmes's complete collation will throw light on the subject; but no ms. which I have had occasion to see follows their arrangement, although some of them differ considerably from the other printed copies.—For the satisfaction of such of my learned readers as may not have had an opportunity or leisure to compare the differences, I shall here give, in two parallel columns, the Complutensian and Roman editions of the whole passage; with the Heb. and Sam. varieties below the former, and the Greek varieties below the latter.

COMPLUTENSIAN.

ROMAN.

Ver. 8. *Και ελαιον εις την φανσιν και θυμιαμα εις το ελαιον της χρισεως, και εις την συνθεσιν του θυμιαματος :*

9. *Και λιθους σαρδιους, και λιθους εις την γλυφην εις την επωμιδα και εις το λογειον.*

10. *Και πας ο σοφος τη διανοια εν υμιν, ελθων εργαζεσθω παντα οσα συνεταζει Κυριος :*

11. *την σκηνην, τα παραρυματα, και τα κατακαλυμματα, και τα διατονια, και τους στυλους, και τους μοχλους, και τους πασσαλους, και τας βασεις :*

*
.
.

*Και λιθους || σαρδιου, και λιθους εις την γλυφην εις την επωμιδα και . * τον ποδηη.*

Και πας . σοφος τη || καρδια εν υμιν ελθων εργαζεσθω παντα οσα συνεταζει Κυριος :

την σκηνην, και τα παραρυματα, και τα κατακαλυμματα, και διατονια, και τους || μοχλους, και τους στυλους |, :

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 8. Perfectly consonant with the Heb. and Sam. texts, and with all the Versions.—Ver. 9. This too agrees with both texts.—Ver. 10. differs from Heb. in reading *ελθων εργαζεσθω* in the sing. with Sam. and Vulg.—Ver. 11. corresponds with Sam. in one respect, having four more copulatives than Heb.; but it differs from both in wanting *αυτης* after *παραρυματα*, and all the other utensils of the tabernacle.

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 8. * *Και ελαιον της χρισεως, και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως*, ms. Oxon. But all the rest agree with Rom.—Ver. 9. || *σαρδεις* Ald. and Leipf.—Ib. * *εις* Alex. Glasg. It is singular that none have *το λογειον* with Compl.—Ver. 10. || *διανοια* Ald. Alex. Glasg. Leipf.—Ver. 11. || It is strange that none follow the more natural order of Complut.: *τους στυλους και τους μοχλους*.

COMPLUTENSIAN.

ΙΘ. και τας σολας τας ἁγίας Λαρων του ἱερεως, και τας σολας εν αἷς λειτουργησιν εν αυταις εν τῷ ἁγίῳ, και τους χιτωνας τοις υἱοις Λαρων της ἱερατειας, και το ελαιον του χρισματος, και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως.

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 19. The first comma of this ver. in Heb. and Sam. is in Compl. transposed after the second comma; and the last two commas in Compl. are wanting in both Heb. and Sam. This appears to me no slender presumption that the editors did not mould their Greek according to the Hebrew text, but only used Gr. mss. that were found the most conformable to it. In the copulatives the Complutensian agrees chiefly with Sam. as usual.

ROMAN.

και τας σολας τας ἁγίας Λαρων του ἱερεως, και τας σολας εν αἷς || λειτουργησιν εν αυταις * . . . και τους χιτωνας τοις υἱοις Λαρων της ἱερατειας, || και το ελαιον του χρισματος, και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως |.

VARIOUS READINGS.

Ver. 19. || λειτουργουσιν, Ald. Alex. Glasg. Leipf. Can.—Ib. * εν τῷ ἁγίῳ, Ald. Alex. Glasg. Leipf. Can. and Copt.—Ib. || So Alex.; but the whole is wanting in Ald. Glasg. Leipf. Canon. and Copt.—Such is the Vatican Copy, with all the varieties which I could collect. When Dr. Holmes's Collations shall appear, my readers will have an opportunity of seeing the real state of the Septuagint in this respect; and perhaps of discovering the causes of so different an arrangement.

Ver. 22. *Clasps*. כַּסָּה; by our translators rendered *bracelets*, after Jerom and Coverdale. Michaëlis has laboured hard to prove that the word means a *nose-ring*. I am persuaded that this, at most, can only be its secondary signification. All the ant. versions have terms that convey the idea of *fastening*, *connecting*, and the like. Sep. indeed have σφραγιδας, *seals*; but this word, I think, may have originally signified *clasps*, for the first *seals* were probably *ligaments*. Syr. כַּסָּה—Onk. and Tharg. כַּסָּה—both rendered in Pol. *armillas*; if properly, I doubt. Compare the roots כַּס and כַּס. Saadias has כַּסָּה; “the meaning of which,” says Michaëlis, “is uncertain.” I have little doubt of its being a compound word from the Perf. כַּס and כַּס, *firmus*, *firmiter compactus*, and that it has the same meaning with כַּסָּה, which is the word used by the Persian translator, commonly rendered *bracelets*. Arab. Erp. כַּסָּה, which is evidently the same with the Heb. כַּס. The Sam. Version has כַּסָּה, which seems to be the Arab. כַּס, still giving the idea of *connecting*, *restraining*, &c. In fine, Gr. Ven. has πορπη, a *clasp*; and so Pagninus, Luther, Castalio, Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, and our Bate. Purver has *books*, not badly, in the primitive signification of the word; and retaining even the literal etymon. *Haak*, in the Dutch dialect, still signifies a *clasp*; and the Belgic *bake*, or *baeck*, the German *baken*, the Islandic *bake*, are all from the same source; and our English *book*, or, as our Anglo-Saxon ancestors wrote it, *bac*, is the very Hebrew word כַּס.

Ib. *Collars*. כַּנָּה. This word is not in the present Hebrew text; but all the copies of Sam. one of Kennicott's mss. at first two of De Rossi's, and most probably other two, in which a word has been erased, with one copy of Onk. and Shemath-Rabba, (an old comment on Exodus, mentioned by Norzius,) have all כַּנָּה, either with or without the copulative. It was also read by Sep. who render it *εμπλοια*.—I once thought, and am still somewhat inclined

to think, that כָּלֵךְ here is in connection with the preceding word טבעת; and that טבעת־כָּלֵךְ may denote *circular rings*, to distinguish them from those טבעת mentioned ch. 25. 26. which I have there translated *staples* *.—Be this as it may, I have no doubt that כָּלֵךְ stood originally in the text, and have accordingly retained it in my Version.

Ib. *Lockets*. כִּמְזָה: a word but twice found in the Bible; here and in Num. 31. 50. By Sep. it is here rendered *περιδεδεσμενα*; but in Num. *εμπλοισιον*, if the word there be not transposed, as, with Michaëlis, I greatly suspect. The other ant. versions vary. Vulg. with Sep, *dextralia*, ornaments worn on the right arm. Onk. כְּמָחֵךְ, and Tharg. כְּמָחֵךְ; which Buxtorf, after Elias Levita, supposes to have been a fillet which was used to compress the breasts; *ad comprimendas mammas*. Syr. *הַמְכִּיכָה*, commonly rendered a *neck-chain*; but perhaps it may also mean an *arm-chain*, and it seems to be the Latin *manica*. Saad. *תְּרִכָה*, in Pol. rendered *zona scutulata*, but by Michaëlis *ornamentum ovale*, from *תְּרִכָה* ovum, says he: but *תְּרִכָה*, I believe, never signifies *ovum*, an egg, properly so called; it only signifies an *abandoned egg*, particularly of the ostrich; or perhaps rather the empty shell of an egg, left by any bird, after the young has been hatched; and in this sense *תְּרִכָה* comes into the radical signification of *תרך*, *relinquere, deferere*. I should rather think that the *תְּרִכָה* of Saadiah is a foreign word, the same with the Latin *torques* †. Arab. Erp. *وَرِيكَة*, by which he probably meant a *zone* or *girdle*, although the word be used for any sort of *ornament*. Perf. *وَرْدَانَة*, *angle-chains*, which were of silver or gold, and worn by women of fashion. Gr. Ven. *νυμφόδεσμον*; a *bride-girdle*; if, perhaps, the translator had not in view another meaning, of which presently.—Such are the versions of the more antient interpreters. Let us next see how כִּמְזָה has been rendered by more modern translators and commentators.—The Jewish writers in general imagine it was an ornament, which either represented the female organ of generation, or was appended nigh to it. So Kimhi, *זוה דפוס של בית דרח*; and Jarhi, “Fuit instrumentum aureum quod dabatur e regione loci mulieris;” and “our Rabbins,” says he, “make כִּמְזָה “ a compound of the initials of three words, *בֵּית מִקְדָּשׁ וְמָה*, *Hic locus libidinis*.” Cocceius and Michaëlis laugh at this interpretation; yet it is not altogether devoid of probability, I mean as to the signification of the word; for as to its being an abbreviation of three words, that smells too much of pure Rabbinitism to be favoured by rational critics.—The Greek translator of Venice may have had some such idea in view when he rendered *νυμφόδεσμον*; and which, perhaps, he considered as equivalent to the *ζώνη παρθενική* of the Greeks; which may have been a similar ornament, for neither its form nor its place is described by any author, known to me at least.—I have been often inclined to think that כִּמְזָה was a *phallus*, which was certainly worn by women both in Egypt and in Assyria; and which, though commonly of fig-tree wood, might also be made of gold, as a more precious and more decorating ornament. Many phallus-gems and talismans remain to this day.—What chiefly leads me to this suspicion is the etymon of the word itself; for, although neither the Heb. nor Chald. nor Syr. guide us to any such radical meaning, there is in the Arabic a word very like it, which signifies *veretrum, penis*; namely, *כִּמְזָה*, from the root *כִּמַּד*, which every scholar knows is convertible into

* The two words are in similar contact in Num. 31. 50. where has been a small transposition, either in the original or in the Septuagint Version. See C. R. on that place. † When the Orientalists vernaculized Latin words, they were wont to take the ablatives.

כֶּמֶח *. Nay, the word כֶּמֶח, without any change of letter, denotes in the same Arabic, *rem formæ rotundioris*; and although the change of כ into ת is not so common in the Oriental dialects as in the Greek, yet I have little doubt of the כֶּמֶח of Ezechiel being the same with the כֶּמֶח of Exodus. See the note on Ezech. 8. 14.—However, as this is only etymological presumption; and as none of the ant. interpreters have thought of a similar meaning, I have, in my version, followed that which I deemed the next most probable signification of the word, namely, a *locket* of some undetermined form; and which will not even exclude that of a *phallus*. It was, most probably, one of those jewels which the Hebrew women borrowed from the Egyptians. By Dathc it is rendered *globulos*; by Michaëlis, *kugeln*.

Ver. 23. With Saadias, I take the ו in וְבָאוּ for the *affix* sing.; but have rendered, according to the idiom of our language, in the plural, *These they brought*; that is, “every man, כל איש, brought *that* which he had to give.” Hence there is no need for an Italic supplement *them*, as in our common English Version.

Ver. 25. Mr. Dimock asks, if we should not in this verse read מִטָּה instead of מִטָּה? Perhaps we should, with Sam. Syr. Onk. Tharg. and very probably Sep. and Saadias: but then we must also change the next word יָבִיא, or refer it, not to the women, but to the men, who brought what the women had spun; for all the copies here read in the plural, and all the versions, except that of Saad. We must therefore either read מְבִיאָה without any certain authority, or admit a change of nominatives, or read with the present text, and say that כל אישה is a collective, having the force of a plural; and that מִטָּה and יָבִיא are *enallagés*.

Ver. 28. In both texts and in all the versions, save Sep. †, רִבְשִׁים, or, as Sam. better, רִבְשִׁים, *aromatics*, precedes שֶׁן, *oil*: but I cannot think that this was the primitive order. It was of *aromatics* that the *unction-oil* and *sweet incense* were to be composed; *aromatics* ought therefore immediately to precede them; and in this order they are arranged ch. 25. 6. and in this same ch. ver. 8. I have therefore, with Houbigant, followed that arrangement here, as the most natural and analogous.

Ver. 35. *Whether of the mechanic or of the artist.* חֹרֵשׁ חֲשָׁב. The former denotes the man who works according to rule, the latter him who contrives and designs. The Septuagint, instead of חֹרֵשׁ, seem to have read קָרָה, as they render τα εργα του εργου: but there is no vestige of such a lection either in Kennicott or De Rossi, and all the other Versions read as we now do.—Both words are well rendered by Gr. Ven. τεχνιτου, διανατου.

C H A P. XXXVI.

Ver. 1. *WISE-MINDED.* Heb. חָכָם לֵב. Lit. *Wise of heart*, “*wise-hearted*,” as in our common version. But wherever this epithet occurs, the reader is to consider it as an Hebraism. Strictly speaking, a man may be replete with wisdom, and yet a poor artificer: and here, perhaps, a better version would have been *ingenious*, *skilful*, or some such term. But I was willing to retain as much of the Hebrew idiom as had not become entirely obsolete: I have

* Nothing is more common than the change of the Heb. כ into the Arabic د. together wanting in all the copies which I have seen, as also in Copt. and Ital.

† In which *aromatics* are al-

only changed *bearded* into *minded*, because *heart*, in modern acceptation, is the seat of neither wisdom, nor skill, nor ingeniousness; but of love, hatred, pride, revenge, and other similar passions; whereas in the *mind* lodge not only wisdom, properly so called, but prudence, foresight, genius, contrivance, invention, and every skilful art.

For the general difficulties which occur in the remainder of this chapter and in the next, see the C. R. on ch. 26 and 27. I will only make a few observations on some particular passages. In

Ver. 7. Mr. Dimock, instead of \square , would read η . This idea he may have borrowed from Vulg. in which there is nothing for the affix \square ; and, perhaps, from the equally ambiguous versions of Onk. Tharg. Syr. and Saad.* But all the Heb. and Sam. copies have \square ; and so Sep. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\pi\gamma\alpha\ \eta\ \alpha\tau\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \iota\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$. So also, explicitly, Erp. Perf. and Gr. Ven.; and the same form is found in Jerem. 49. 9. and Obed. 1. 5. without any variety of lection; save that, in the latter place, 3 mss. have \square .

Ver. 8. From this to the end of ch. 29. there is a strange diversity between the arrangement of Sep.† and that of the Heb. and Sam. texts, and of all the other versions. How this confusion has happened, it is not easy to account for; but it is of ancient standing, as it is followed by the Coptic version; as most probably by the old Italic‡; nor has any ms. yet appeared to vary, in any thing of importance, from the printed editions. Whether the editors of Compl. had any such mss. before them, is much to be doubted; and we wait, with some impatience, for Dr. Holmes's collation of these chapters.—If the Complutensian editors did nothing more than change the arrangement of their mss. to make them correspond with the Hebrew order, they are not much to be blamed; although they ought to have warned their readers of their having so done. But if, as has been suspected§, they did more than this—if they forged a Greek text of Sep. to make it tally with Heb. and Vulg.; they did a nefarious deed: but I am very unwilling to foster this suspicion, and trust that they will yet be found to be as faithful editors here as I can prove them to be in many other places, where they have unjustly been accused of falsification.

Ver. 38. *The tegument of their capitals.* This, I think, is the true meaning of צֹפֶה רֹאשֵׁיהֶם , without even supposing the text to be corrupted; for צֹפֶה may be a singular noun, (the *abscute* for the *constructed*;) although I am apt to think that the original reading was צָפָי , as in ch. 38. 17. See also Isaiah, 30. 22. where we have a similar construction צָפָי פִּסְלֵי . The common mode of pointing and rendering the words contradicts the order in ch. 26. 37. where Moses is expressly bid to overlay, not only the *chapters* and *fillets*, as they are rendered in our Vulgar Version, but also the pillars themselves.

* But there is no plain proof that any of them read differently from the present text. followed by the ed. of Frankfort and that of Venice in 1687.

† Except Complut.

‡ See Sabatier, vol. i. p. 209.

§ Nobilius in Schol. ad cap. 28. thus expresses himself: "Hæc in Vulg. et Complut. habentur, cap. 37. et aliqua ex parte ad initium 38. Et res, quæ commemoratur, et ordo idem in utraque. Verba etiam, quibus exponuntur in Compl. propius accedunt ad Vulg. et Hebr. quam nostra. Veruntamen pleraque illa in collatis codicibus non sunt inventa." De hoc dolendum!

C H A P. XXXVIII.

Vcr. 8. *UNDER the inspection of the women, who ministered at the entry of the door of the convention-tent.* בְּמִרְאֵת וּדְבָאוֹת אִשֶּׁר צְבִאוֹ פֶתַח אֹהֶל; for such I take to be the genuine reading; namely, מִרְאֵת in the sing. with the present Heb. unpointed text and 2 Sam. mss.; and דְּבָאוֹת in the plural, with 9 Sam. and 7 Heb. mss. But how are the words to be rendered? By Sep. thus: *ἐκ τῶν κοινοῦμένων τῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν, αἱ ἐνὶ τῷ πύλῳ τῆς θυρᾶς τῆς οἰκίας τοῦ μαρτυρίου.* It would be strange if they found this in the present text. They seem to have read דְּבָאוֹת in lieu of מִרְאֵת, and צְבִאוֹ for צְבִאוֹ; but there is no vestige of such a reading in any Heb. or Sam. copy, or in any of the other Versions.—Vulg. *De speculis mulierum, quæ excubebunt in ostio tabernaculi.* Pagninus, more literally, *Ex speculis convenientium, quæ conveniebant ad ostium tabernaculi:* and more scrupulously still our English translators—“Of the looking-glasses * of the women assembling, which assembled at the door of the tabernacle.”—Much in the same manner have the words been rendered by almost all modern translators; for, though they vary somewhat in the rendering of מִרְאֵת and צְבִאוֹ, they generally agree in rendering מִרְאֵת or מִרְאֵת *mirrors*. But when Dathe and Rosenmüller assert that all the ancient interpreters render in the same manner, I apprehend they make a rash assertion †, as shall be shewn hereafter. But I agree with them in another point; namely, that, although all the antients, as well as moderns, had so rendered, the rendering is not admissible ‡.—Herman Gideon Clemens (apud Ugolini, tom. 19. p. 1503,) saw well that the common version was improper; but he has substituted one, which, in my opinion, is equally indefensible, although it has been adopted by some latter critics of uncommon note. He thinks that מִרְאֵת signifies *figures, images*; and that צְבִאוֹת signifies *adorning*, that is, *elegant*; and that the historian means to say that on the laver were carved *elegant figures*, of cherubs (for example), or other images. Hence Dathe thus forms his version: “Porro fecit labrum æneum, et operculum ejus æneum, cum figuris elegantibus, quæ ornabant ostium tabernaculi conventus.” That is, “He moreover made a laver of brass, with its cover of brass, with elegant figures, which ornamented the door of the tabernacle of convention.” I doubt if a more forced explication have been given of any Scripture-text. A more specious version, in Clemens’s hypothesis, would be: *Et fecit labrum æneum, et operculum ejus æneum cum conspicuis ornamentis; ad ostium tabernaculi conventus.* But even this interpretation appears to me contrary to both grammar and analogy.—The best commentary on the words, I think, is a passage in 1 Sam. 2. 22. where וְנָשִׁים וּדְבָאוֹת פֶתַח אֹהֶל evidently means “the women who served, or ministered, at the door of the tabernacle.”—Can any thing be more similar? The ob-

* This was a very improper term for mirrors of brass.
“verba tentus de specula mulierum explicantur.” Dathe in loc.
“antiquorum interpretum, tamen adeo difficilis est et dura, ut mirum videri possit eam sese probasse tot viris doctis, nisi experientia doceret, uno errore admissio, sequi deinde plures. . . Sed tam solide hanc explicationem refutavit Clemens (Disput. de Labro æneo), ut eo lecto non potem futurum esse qui specula et mulieres textui Hebræo perperam illatas esse neget.”—De speculis, concedo: non item de mulieribus.

† “Jam vero versiones antiquæ unanimi consensu
‡ “Quæ explicatio, quanquam est quoque

jection that נשים is wanting in Exodus is frivolous: נשים is included in רַבְּנָתָיִם, as it is in רַבְּנָתָיִם, in Gen. 24. 11. and in other places.—That washing the feet of men was a part of female occupation, is plain from 1 Sam. 25. 41: "Let thine handmaid," says Abigail to David, "be a waiting-woman, to wash the feet of my lord's servants."—Mary Magdalen washed the feet of Jesus with her tears instead of water, and the apostle Paul ranks among the good qualities of a Christian widow, that she hath washed the feet of the saints: *et diligens pedes eius lavavit*. 1 Tim. 5. 10.—Indeed it was antiently thought no demeaning office for women even of the first quality. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us, that the daughter of Cleobulus, who was both a philosopher and monarch, was not ashamed to wash the feet of her father's guests*.

I am fully persuaded, then, that the meaning of the Hebrew words is precisely what I have given in my Version; or in Latin more literally thus: "Fecitque labrum æneum, et operculum ejus æneum, sub inspectione mulierum adstantium (five, ministrantium) ad ostium tabernaculi conventus."—Nor is this a new interpretation. I find it in most of our English translations prior to the Bishops' Bible: "He made the laver of brass, and the fote of it also of brass, in the sight † of them that did watch before the dore of the tabernacle of witness." But, in Parker's version, the authority of David Kimhi got the better of grammar and good sense ‡; and *glasses* were introduced into the text, with this curious note: "Rabbi Kimhi saith, that the women brought their looking-glasses, which were of brass, or fine mettall, and offered them to the use of the tabernacle."—That mirrours were antiently made of polished brass, there is no doubt; but that the laver of the Mosaic tabernacle was made of brazen mirrours, there is not the smallest proof or probability.

I have said that the common version is contrary to grammar, as well as to good sense: I am now going to prove the former assertion. The word מַרְאִי, from מָרָא, though it occurs above an hundred times in the Heb. Scriptures, never elsewhere signifies a *mirror*: why then should it have that signification here? especially as in the whole Pentateuch a mirror is not so much as mentioned, under any denomination; nor, indeed, as far as I know, in any Hebrew writing prior to the Babylonish captivity §.

The first time I meet with a *mirror* in the Bible is in the Book of Wisdom, 7. 26: *οὐρανοῦ γλαῦμα γὰρ ἐστὶ φωτὸς οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἑσπέρητιον ἀνιλεῖται τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας*. What Hebrew word (if ever the book were in Hebrew) corresponded with *ἑσπέρητιον*, we know not; but it could not, I think, be מַרְאִי.

* H de Kleoboulou θυγατὴρ, τοῦ σοφοῦ καὶ Λιυδίων μοναρχήντος, τῶν ξένων τῶν πατρῶων οὐκ ἤδετο ἀποβαίνειν τοὺς ποδας. Stromat. l. vi. p. 523. ed. Sylburg.

† Sight then meant *inspection*, and has still that signification in Lancashire and other counties; and a *fighter*, I believe, in some parts of the island, signifies an *inspector*.

‡ Was it Luther's good sense, or his good star, that led him to translate as he has done? "Und machte das hand-faß von ertz, und seinen fufs auch von ertz: gegeben den weibern, die vor der thür der hütte des stifts dienen." How elegant! and how badly *bettered* by Hezel! "Besser: von (aus) SPINGELN derjenigen weiber." § I know that Job, 37. 18. has been alleged as a proof, where מַרְאִי מַרְאִי has been by moderns rendered *sicut speculum fufum*. But besides that the word here is מַרְאִי, not מַרְאִי, it is very doubtful whether מַרְאִי be well rendered *speculum*. I have endeavoured to shew the contrary in my C. R. on that place. At any rate, it cannot be brought as a proof that מַרְאִי, in Exod. has the same meaning, even by those who, with Michaëlis, believe that the Book of Job is the most antient of all Hebrew writings; which, in my opinion, is a flagrant paradox.

I come now to the Oriental Versions, which have generally been supposed to corroborate the translation of Sep. and Vulg.; but which, I think, is not the case. Onk. has מַחְזֵי, supposed by Buxtorf to be the plural of מַחְזֵה in construction, and by him rendered *specula*. But is not this *gratis dictum*? and may not מַחְזֵה be a feminine singular of the same meaning with מַחְזֵה?—The Bab. Thargum has here only מַחְזֵה, which I hardly think any one would render *specula*.—Syr. has מַחְזֵה, preceded by בֵּית; which why it should be rendered *specula*, I cannot well conceive, as the word every where else signifies *visus, aspectus*. The term which the Syr. translator of Wisdom uses to express a mirror is מַחְזֵה; and the same term is employed by the Syr. translator of the N. T. in 1 Cor. 13. 12; and in James, 1. 23. It is observable that the Syr. translator of Exod. not only uses a word which everywhere else signifies *aspectus*, but inserts the word בֵּית before מַחְזֵה, to prevent, as it were, the reader from supposing that this latter denoted the materials out of which the laver was made*.—Saad. מַחְזֵה, preceded by כִּי, and rendered in the Polyglott a *speculis*: but wrongly, I think, for two reasons: First, מַחְזֵה elsewhere never signifies a *mirror*: the word used for a mirror, both in the Book of Wisdom and in the N. T. is uniformly מַחְזֵה. Secondly, although the preposition כִּי sometimes signifies *a* or *ex*, yet it often signifies *ante, ad, coram*; and is in that sense equivalent to the Heb. בֵּי, *ante conspectum mulierum*, &c. being equivalent to *in conspectu mulierum*.—Even Arab. Erp. has מַחְזֵה, not מַחְזֵה; which former certainly signifies *visus, aspectus*: but whether it ever signify *speculum*, is at least very doubtful.—The Sam. Version has מַחְזֵה; but why it should be rendered *specula*, I confess I see no reason. The truth seems to be, that the Latin translators of all those Versions were guided by Sep. and Vulg. without giving themselves the trouble to analyse and compare the words of their originals.—The Perfic Version has, in my opinion, been treated in a similar manner. His מַחְזֵה נִמְשָׁה is rendered in *specie speculorum*; whereas, I think, it should be rendered in *presentia*, or in *conspectu*.—Remain the Jerus. Tharg. and Gr. Ven. both which have unequivocally words which denote *mirrors*: the former מַחְזֵה, the latter *specula*.—I now leave the intelligent reader to judge for himself which version he will prefer.

Ver. 29. *Seventy talents*. The Cod. Alex. of Sep. has 470 talents, τετρακοσια ἑβδομηκοντα; and so Glasg. Leipf. and Canon.: and, indeed, when we consider what was made of the brass, this appears no improbable calculation, especially if we compare it with the quantities of gold and silver. But there is no such lection in any copy of the text, nor in any of the ant. versions. There is a mistake in my Var. Readings on this ver. Vol. I. p. 175, where the mark of reference || should be placed in the text after “talents,” and in Var. Readings the words *seven talents* expunged. Or the marks may remain as they are, and *seven* changed into *seventy*. But the former mode is the better.

* His Latin translator in the Polyglott renders, *inter specula*: and hence, perhaps, another ridiculous comment, namely, that the laver was placed in the midst of a number of mirrors. But although בֵּית, the same with the Heb. בֵּי, sometimes signifies *inter*, it is here only to express the Heb. בֵּי, and means no more than *in*, as the Heb. בֵּי has sometimes the same signification.

C H A P. XXXIX.

Ver. 18. THIS and the four following verses, and indeed a great part of the whole chapter, are so abridged and confused in the Latin Vulg. that one is apt to think it could not so come from the pen of Jerom.—It is pity that most of the old Italic is here lost.

C H A P. XL.

Ver. 7. *AND shalt place water by it.* Here both texts have **שם**, not **שמה**, which, however, is the reading of 6. mss. That the meaning is *by it*, not *in it*, has been shewn above. The whole verse is wanting in all the editions of Sep. except Compl.; but it is found with an asterisk in the Colb. ms. in Montfaucon; which ms. has also many such additions in this and the three foregoing chapters; probably the work of Origen, to fill up the defects which he found in the copies of Sep.; and perhaps the Complutenian editors took their text from such like mss.—Here Compl. has **και θησεις εν αυτω υδωρ**; as Vulg. Syr. and Saad. understood the text. But the just-mentioned Colb. ms. has, more properly, **και θησεις εναι υδωρ**.—So also Onk. Tharg. Perf. Erp. and even Gr. Ven. which agrees exactly with Colb.

Ver. 27. *On which be made aromatic incense to be burned.* The Heb. lit. *be burnt*, &c. But as this was the talk of Aaron, I have given the phrase another turn, which the idiom of the original readily admits, both here and in many other similar cases.

Ver. 34. *The cloud covered the convention-tent, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.* I shall here content myself with presenting to my readers two notes of a very different complexion; the one by a German, the other by an English, divine.—“Apparet, hanc nubem eandem fuisse ac eam, quæ Israelitas in itinere ducebat, de qua cap. 13. 21. Extructo tabernaculo hæc nubes supra illud consedit, in signum, Jehovah singulari quadam ratione ibi esse presentem—Sane necessarium erat, ut Israelitæ hujusmodi signum spectabile præsentia divinae haberent. Populus enim adhuc rudis et omnia e sensibus inetiens mox potuisset numinis imaginem e lapide, ligno, &c. formare, atque ita ad idololatriam prolabi, nisi Deus illâ re sapienter cavisset, ne hoc fieret. כבוד יהוה videtur fuisse splendor eximius, quem nubes illa emisit.—Vulgaris opinio erat multarum veterum gentium, præcipuè Orientalium, Deum habitare in luce et splendore, cui nullus alius possit comparari.” Thus Kosenmüller.—How more piously the good Bishop Wilson: “This book concludes with an account of another constant miracle, vouchsafed them for forty years together, to convince the Israelites of God’s especial presence with them. And the prophet Isaiah, 4. 5. signifies to us, that this was a figure or representation of Christ’s continued care over his church; which God grant he may continue to us and our posterity for ever!”

LEVITICUS. CHAP. I.

Ver. 2. **I**T has been well observed, by Houbigant and others, that the second part of this verse is wrongly pointed. The *almach*, as it is called, should be placed after דְּבַר־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, and not after לִידָה; and this is the punctuation of at least one very ancient Sam. ms. It is also the punctuation of Syr. and Saadiah, and ought, I think, to be that of Sep.; for although, in the Vat. edition, the comma is after Κύριον, and although Grabe has pointed the Alex. ms. in the same manner, the Complutensian editors more judiciously placed it after κτηνων *, although this be not noticed by Bos; and so has Montfaucon pointed the Colb. ms. in his Hexapla. But how will this agree with the καὶ which follows κτηνων? I answer, that that καὶ is either an interpolation or a mere expletive, as both it and the Latin *et* often are. It is wanting in Alex. Glasg. Leipf. Colb. and I doubt not in many other mss.—I cannot, therefore, but agree with Houbigant, whose version is: *Si quis vestrum bestiam Domino de pecoribus oblaturus est, de bobus eam et de ovibus offeretis*. The substance of his note will be found below †.—Rosenmüller: *Si quis Deo offerre velit domum ex animantibus, id sumat e bobus vel ovibus*: and although Dathe points differently, his version is to the same purpose; *Si quis vestrum Jovæ numus offerre velit, id, si ex pecudibus est, sit vel ex bobus, vel ex ovibus, et capris*. The *oves* and *capræ* are contained in one Heb. word, צֶמֶד, which I render *flock*.

Ver. 3. *A male without blemish, &c.* That the Supreme Being would imperiously require of mankind bloody victims, and even point out the particular animals that were to be immolated upon his altar, it is, to me, highly incredible; but that superstition, the child of ignorance and fear, should think of offering such sacrifices, it is not at all wonderful; nor need we think it strange that Moses, although a wise legislator, in this indulged the humour of so gross and carnal a people as were the Israelites. All the nations around them offered similar victims, from the banks of the Euphrates to the banks of the Nile. The Egyptians, in particular, among whom they had so long sojourned, not only sacrificed animals to their gods, but selected the best of their kind: *Τους καθαροὺς ἀρσενας των βοων, και τους μοσχους, δι παντες Αιγυπτιοι θνους* ‡. Indeed, I have ever been convinced, since I was capable of reflection, that the whole sacrificial and ceremonial laws of Moses were chiefly borrowed from the priests of Egypt, but prudently accommodated by the Hebrew legislator to the relative situation of his own people, divested of profane licentiousness and barefaced idolatry, and restrained to the worship of one supreme God, who created the heavens and the earth, and whom he was pleased to call *IEVE*, *IAO*, or *JEHOVAH*. This name, I think, he must have learnt in Mi-

* In Ald. there is no comma till after προβατων. † "Genus tangitur in דְּבַר־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ pecorum a plebe sponte offerendorum, ut postea, in דְּבַר־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ et צֶמֶד, species assignetur: Si tu offeres holocaustum de pecudibus, offeres de bobus et ovibus . . . ubi observandum, non sacrificia ut fiant imperari, ut rectè observat Theodoretus. Nam conditionem habent precepta quæ hæc sunt: Si tu offeras."—So also Secker, in his ms. notes: "Point and translate . . . of the cattle: ye shall bring your offering of the herd or of the flock." ‡ Herodot. Euterpé. 41. And Chærenon (apud Grotium): των βοων τας θηλειας παρηγουσσι.

dian : that he could not learn it in Egypt, is clear from this, that the name was not known there before he announced it as the name of the *God of the Hebrews*; and JEHOVAH himself is made to say, on Mount Sinai, that he had never till then manifested himself by that name : but that the name, before that, was known in Midian, nay that it was the name of the Deity whom Jethro principally, or perhaps exclusively, worshipped, to me appears very probable from several circumstances. In the first place, it is not so much as hinted that Jethro or his family were idolaters; the only religious difference between them and Moses seems to have been *circumcision*. Secondly, when Moses, on his return from Egypt, tells his father-in-law all that *Jehovah* had done for the Israelites, his father-in-law is not, like Pharaoh, astonished at the novelty of the name, but rejoices "for all the good things which *Jehovah* had done to the Israelites." Exod. 18. 9.—And again he exclaims, "Blessed be *Jehovah*, who hath rescued you from the hands of the Egyptians : and now," adds he, "I know that *Jehovah* is greater than all the other gods*."—But that the name *Jehovah* was at that time not unknown in Midian, in Moab, and even as far as the Euphrates, seems clear from the story of Balaam. It is JEHOVAH whom he consults before he goes with Balak's messengers :—"Lodge here this night," says he, "and what JEHOVAH shall say to me I will report to you." Num. 22. 8. And next morning : "Go back to your own land : for JEHOVAH permitteth me not to go with you." Ver. 14.—Nay, in ver. 18, he expressly calls Jehovah his own God : "I could not go beyond the word of JEHOVAH my GOD."—The same language he uses to Balak himself, ch. 23. 3 : "Stand thou there by thine altars, while I go to see if JEHOVAH † will meet me."—Again, ver. 8 : "How shall I execrate whom JEHOVAH hath not execrated?"—And, ver. 12 : "Must I not be careful to say only what JEHOVAH putteth in my mouth?"—Balak, too, uses the same term, ver. 18 : "What saith JEHOVAH ?" And, ch. 24. 13 : "From honour JEHOVAH hath precluded thee."—From all this I think it probable that the name JEHOVAH was known in Midian, Moab, and Syria, before the mission of Moses; and that Moses may have borrowed it thence.—Those who literally believe what is related in the third chapter of Exodus will sneer at this remark; and they are welcome so to do; I will never be angry with any one for believing either too much or too little.

Ver. 9. *It is a sweet-savour'd holocaust to the Lord.* וְהָיָה חֵטְא נִיחֹחַ לַיהוָה. It was a common idea among the ancients that the fat of sacrifices was grateful to the gods. Chryses, the priest of Apollo, thus addresses him in Homer. Il. α. 39. 40.

—Εἰ ποτε τοὶ χροχίεντ' ἐπὶ νηὸν ἑρμῆος,
 Ἡ εἰ δὲ ποτε τοῖς κατὰ πύκνῃ μερὶ εὐχῇ
 Τσαυρῶν, ἢ δ' ἀργῶν, τὸδε μοι κρήνην μέλδωρ.

Ver. 15. *And pinch off its head.* וּמָלַךְ אֶת רִאשׁוֹ. Some interpreters think that מָלַךְ means *not to pinch off*, but *to twist back*. This interpretation is chiefly founded on ch. 5. 8. where (say they) it is clear that the pigeon's head was not *pinched off*, but *only twisted back*; as the

* This mode of expression by no means implies that Jethro adored any other Gods with Jehovah, or considered him as only relatively superior to other gods. Solomon, in his prayer addressed to God himself, uses a similar comparison : "O Lord! the God of Israel! there is no God, either in the heavens above or in the earth below, like thee!" &c.—2 Chron. 6. 14. † So the present text; but here Sam. and Sep. have *God*.

Vulg. has here rightly rendered, *retorto ad collum capite*. I will not positively say that the Vulgate has not rightly rendered, because the meaning of מִלֵּךְ is not easily ascertained. It is thought indeed to be the same with the Syr. מִלֵּךְ, and by that word it is rendered in the Syr. version; but the precise meaning of that word is equally uncertain. In Ezrah, 9. 3. it clearly means *to pluck off, evellere*; being there equivalent to the Heb. מָרַשׁ. It has the same meaning in the New Testament, Mark, 2. 23. and Luke, 6. 1. corresponding, in both places, with the Gr. τὰλλω.—The same may be said of Onk. and the Sam. translator, who retain the Heb. word; but both Thargums have words that denote *avulsion*. Bab. חָרַץ. Jerus. חָרַץ.—The פִּצֵּל of Saad. and of Erp. has certainly a similar meaning; and why the ἀποκυννῶσι of Sep. should be rendered *retorquebit*, I am at a loss to know. Nobilius was probably led to this interpretation by the Vulgate*.—The Greek of Venice has ἀποκυννῶσι, *decollabit*.

But is not the meaning of מִלֵּךְ determined by ch. 5. 8. where it is expressly said that the head is *not to be separated*, וְלֹא יִבְרָל—No, this is very far from being decisive; the words may relate, not to the division of the head from the body of the pigeon, but to dividing the pigeon itself, as was to be done with regard to the larger victims.—The best explication of לֹא יִבְרָל, perhaps, in ch. 5. 8. is, as Parkhurst remarks, ver. 17 of ch. 1.—After all, I would not positively assert that the head was separated from the body. The word מִלֵּךְ may signify to make a *section* or *cut* in the head; perhaps by pinching it with the nails, so that the blood might distil from the wound. The Perfic translator seems so to have understood it: and there is a Greek version (by whom it is uncertain) in Montfaucon which coincides with this idea: λεπτῶσι, *decorticabit, pellem detrahet*.—I have seen ducks and geese killed in the following manner: they were hung upon a peg by their legs, and a slit made in their heads, from the neck, to let out the blood; and there they hung until they were dead. As the great point with the Hebrew legislator was, to have the victims thoroughly bled before they were immolated, this might be deemed the best way of treating feathered victims; and I confess that I am almost inclined to believe that this was the case.—The heads of other animals were burned along with their quarters; so from analogy we might suppose that the head of the pigeon and turtle-dove was likewise burned; but analogy is not always a sure guide, and the heads of the feathered kind may have been rejected on account of the blood, which would clot and accumulate from the section being made there.—I add the versions of two celebrated modern translators, Dathe and Michaëlis. *Sacerdos ad aram caput ejus ungue refecet*—"Der priester soll sie zum altar bringen, den kopf abkneipen," &c. So Luther before him, followed by Hezel.

Ver. 16. *With its contents*. בְּנִצְתָּהּ. Sam. בְּנִצְתָּהּ. In our common version, the word is rendered *with his feathers*; and in this sense it was understood by Sep. and Vulg. †, who seem to have had before them the Sam. lection. I think נִצְתָּהּ, or rather, as it is in 3 mss. בְּנִצְתָּהּ, the genuine reading; but I cannot think that it means *feathers*. It evidently means something belonging to the crop; and in this sense it was understood by Onk. Syr. Tharg. Sam. Verf. both Arabs. and Perf. It is also so interpreted by Jarhi, who cites Abba Jose

* Or, perhaps, by another reading called the *Samaritanic*, in the Rom. ed. ἀναλασαι. † So also equivalently Sym. Theod. and Gr. Ven.; and so most modern translators, even Le Clerc, Houbigant, Michaëlis, Dathe, and Hezel: but not so Schulz and Rosenmüller, who saw that the context could not well bear such a rendering.

Ben-Chanan as being of the same opinion. As to the etymon of the word, some think it may be derived from the passive voice of צָצָה: I doubt.—Were I to assign it any special root, it would be the Arab. نَضَحَ, which would answer, I think, to all the various acceptations of the word, and is peculiarly proper to express the swelling form of a bird's crop. Be this as it may, I am persuaded that נִצַּח, or נִצָּח, here signifies not the feathers of the bird, but *the contents* of its crop; whether we translate it by that word, or, with *Junius*, by *sordibus* or *fimo*.

C H A P. II.

Ver. 1. *ANY* one. נֶפֶשׁ. Lit. *a soul*; an Hebraism which even our last translators thought it right not to retain here, although it was used by all their predecessors, save the English Genevans. R. Jarhi thinks it is here employed to denote, that if the poor man bring but a poor gift from his *soul*, it will be equally acceptable as a bull or a ram. The truth is, that נֶפֶשׁ (as Bishop Horsley has, in one of his sermons, well observed) is often more properly rendered *person*: and indeed, in our own language, the two words are frequently confounded. Thus we say, that such a place contains so many thousand *souls*; and, Not less than ten thousand *souls* were slain in such a battle.

Ib. *A donative*. מִנְחָה. The verbal root is not found in Hebrew, but it is frequent in Arab. and means *to give*. Hence מִנְחָה means a gift in general of any kind; but when spoken of sacrifices, it denotes any unbloody oblation made to the Lord. Our translators call it a *meat-offering*. A *meal-offering*, or *meal-gift*, would now be more proper, and Syr. has so expressed it, קִרְבָּנָא סַמִּידָא, *munus simila*, "a gift of flour."—Syr. *ἑρπον* *ὑποσπον*—Vulg. *oblationem sacrificii*: and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. Perf. and both Arabs.—Gr. Ven. *προσφοραν μετρυματος*.—The word *donative* appeared to me the most proper to express the pure meaning of the original.

Ver. 2. *As a memorial of it*. אֶת זִכְרוֹתָהּ. Sep. *το* *μνηστικον* *αυτης*—Vulg. *memoriale*: and so equivalently all the ant. interpreters, save Saad. who has פְּחֻדָּה, *fragrance*; and Erp. who has פְּחֻדָּה, of the same meaning.—According to this, Delgado corrects the English version into "*the sweet savour thereof*;" and quotes Hof. 5. 7. *, and Isa. 66. 3. in support of this translation.—Let us examine them a little. In Hof. זִכְרוֹ is indeed, in our English version, rendered "*the scent thereof*," with *memorial* in the margin. But this latter is the rendering of all the antients; nor do I see any reason for departing from them †. Isaiah, 66. 3. is also quoted by Michaëlis, to shew that זִכְרוֹ there "*sine dubio est adolens*." Now I doubt very much, and believe that the Greek and Arabic versions have well expressed the meaning: *ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν λαβανον εἰς μνηστικον*; and that the marginal reading of our common version, "he that maketh a memorial," is preferable to that in the text; although the latter has been followed by Lowth and Dodson. See C. R. on Isaiah.—On the whole, I see no good reason to depart here, or indeed any where else, from the common acceptance of זִכְרוֹ.—If the reader wish to see what may be said on the opposite side, he may consult Michaëlis's *Supplementa ad Lex. Heb.* or Rosenmüller's *Scholia*.

* It is ver. 8, according to the common division.

† See C. R. on that place.

Ver. 4. *Baked in an oven.* כַּחֲפוֹת תֹּנֹר. Sep. *πεπεμμεται ἐκ κλίβανου*—Vulg. *coctum in cli-bano*.—All the Oriental versions, even Perf. retain the Heb. word; which shews that it was a common and well-known utensil in all the East; yet what was its precise nature and form, it is not easy to determine; although the word, in one shape or other, occurs a dozen of times at least in the Hebrew Scriptures. The first time it occurs is in Gen. 15. 17. where it is generally rendered *furnace*; and this, perhaps, is its primitive meaning*. Perhaps the first ovens were furnaces.—“It is common through all Asia,” says Chardin †, “to make an oven in the ground four or five feet deep, and three feet in diameter, well plastered with mortar ‡. “When it is hot, they place the bread, which is commonly long (like some of our morning tea-rolls,) and not thicker than a finger, against the sides, and it is baked in a moment.”—I once thought that a passage in Levit. 11. 35. was decisive against this being the meaning of תֹּנֹר here. It is there ordered, that the *oven*, on which any thing unclean may have fallen, *shall be broken*. But the Hebrew word is not there שָׁבַר, but נָחַץ, which signifies rather to *destroy, demolish, undo*, than to *break in pieces*; and is, consequently, as applicable to an *oven* of the above description as to any other. Nor is it only in the original that the distinction is here observed: Sep. in ver. 33. has *συντρίβεται*; in ver. 35 *καταμεινύσονται*. So Vulg. in the former *frangendum est*, in the latter *destruentur*. So Onk. in ver. 33 *תִּתְבַּרֵּץ*, in ver. 35 *יִתְרַעַץ*. And so, distinctly, all the other versions, except Gr. Ven.; which, in both places, has *μασσεται*. There is then no cogent reason, from that passage, to induce us to believe, for certain, that the *ovens* mentioned in Levit. might not be ovens like those described by Chardin; especially as, in all the other passages in which the word תֹּנֹר occurs, it seems to denote a *furnace* rather than an *oven* properly so called. There is one passage, indeed, which appears to make this controvertible; it is Lament. 5. 10. in which we read: “Our skin was black as an oven, כַּתֹּנֹר:” on which Harmer makes the following observation: “St. Jerome, in his Commentary on Lam. 5. 10. describes an Eastern oven as a round vessel of brass, blackened on the outside by the surrounding fire, which heats it within §.”—If this were the work of Jerom, it would deserve attention; but it is a spurious composition, unworthy that critic; and can at most give us a vague idea of the *ovens* with which the writer was acquainted.

There is yet another passage which may seem to throw some light on the matter; it is Levit. 26. 26. where, among the other calamities with which the rebellious Israelites are threatened, we find the following: “On my breaking your staff of bread, ten women shall bake for you in *one oven*,” that is, there shall be such a scarcity of bread, that one oven shall suffice to bake for ten families. This, I think, is a proof that the ovens were small; and a presumption that, in better times, each family had its own oven; whether that were a furnace dug in the ground, as has been said, or, as most modern critics think, a portable stone pitcher, still used by the Arabs for baking, and which Golius thus describes: “Est plerumque in fundo amplior, supernè, ubi orificium, angustior: in quo panem coquant, fere lateribus applicari

* Hence some lexicographers have placed it under the root נָחַץ, † See Harmer, vol. i. p. 233.

‡ As in ver. 33, when speaking of earthen vessels. § “In pelle exusta deformitatem obscenam ostendit, quam fame, et siti, et nuditate, inter hostes passi sunt. Clibanus est coquendis panibus ænei vasculi deducta rotunditas, quæ sub urentibus flammis ardet intrinsecus.” Inter opera spuria Hieron. tom. v. p. 841.

"solitum."—In Scotland, not many years ago, a funilar oven was very common, even in genteel families. It was a pot of cast iron, with three feet, set upon hot coals, and covered with an iron lid, on which other coals were placed; and thus, between the two fires, a loaf of excellent bread was baked in a short space of time. I have seen, in England, copper ovens used for the same purpose.

Ver. 5. *On a fire-plate.* על המצבת. Sep. *ama saryasas*. It is evidently the *tagen* of the Arabs, which is described by Shaw as a shallow earthen vessel like a frying-pan. This was in Barbary: but I am inclined to think that the *tagen* of Palestine and Arabia was a flat plate of iron or brass, convex above, that the fire below might have a greater effect, on which thin cakes were speedily baked; like the Scottish *scons*, baked on a *griddle*, or *girdle*, which are sometimes so thin that one may twist them around his finger.—See Harmer, vol. i. p. 232.

Ver. 7. *In the frying-pan.* מצדשת. Sep. *ama saryasas*—Vulg. *de craticula*: and so equivalently Syr. and Onk. They took it for a sort of *gridiron*; but etymology is against them, and the word seems clearly to denote a frying-pan, *frixorium*. And so both Arabs, the Sam. Verf. Perf. and Gr. Ven. *; to which we ought to add Tharg. מצדשת, badly rendered *de craticula* in the Polyglott, as no such meaning can be derived from the root צדש. See Buxtorf, Lex. Chald.

Ver. 13. *All your donatives ye shall season with salt: nor shall ye withhold from them the salt of the portion of your God.* The last member of this verse has been variously rendered and interpreted. The Heb. words are ולא תשבת מלח ברית אלוך; by our English translators rendered, "Neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking:" and so indeed equivalently all the antients, save that Saadias explains it thus: "Thou shalt not withdraw from thine oblation salt, because it is the covenant of thy God."—With this explanation most modern commentators have been contented. Salt, say they, among antient nations, was a sign of friendship, as we learn from Homer. At this day, when the Arabian emirs make a league, they eat together some pieces of bread sprinkled with salt; and hence the covenant made between them is called BARAT-MILECH, which is only the Heb. מלח ברית inverted. Notwithstanding the speciousness of this interpretation, it has not given universal satisfaction. Michaëlis imagined that ברית should be written בורית, and that it has here the same meaning as in Jerem. 2. 22. Then מלח בורית will be *pure salt*; that is, *salt-petre*, or nitre; which it is supposed was called *pure*, to distinguish it from *sea-salt*. This is ingenious, but not convincing; for, first of all, if the legislator had meant to express *pure salt*, he would most probably have used מלח ברור or מלח טהור. Secondly, the only proof, or rather presumption, that בורית, *borith*, ever signifies *nitre*, is founded on this very disputed passage. Thirdly, the word אלוך would, if that were the meaning of בורית, come in most awkwardly. I cannot, therefore, accede to this interpretation, although it has been followed by Dathe and Schulz.

Houbigant endeavours to make a sort of sense out of the common acceptation of the word ברית, by explaining it allegorically, as if it were consimular to *sweet savour*; so that the

* *Assados*.

meaning would be: As sweet odours are grateful to the smell, and seasoned things to the taste, so sacrifices daily offered are agreeable to God, and a pledge of the perpetuity of his covenant with mankind.—It is rare that the good sense of this writer deals in such conceits.

Are then we to acquiesce in the common interpretation? I think, not; were it but for one single reason, thus briefly stated by Schulz: "This explication is foreign to the purport of the context, where the question is not whether salt was used in covenants, but why salt, ordered to be offered with every oblation, should be called *the salt of the covenant of God*?"

After a careful examination of the difficulty, I think it is to be resolved thus. The word בֶּרֶךְ here does not signify *covenant*, but *food*, from בָּרַךְ. It is found in this signification three times in one chapter of 2 Sam. 13. 5, 7, 10.—It is here visibly in construction, governed by מֶלֶךְ, and governing אֱלֹהִים. The literal version then will be *sal edulii Dei tui, the salt of the food, or portion, of thy God*. See ch. 3. 11. where that part of the sacrifice which was burnt on the altar is called "the food, or aliment, לֶחֶם, of a † sweet-favoured | burnt-offering to the " Lord."—This part of the sacrifice was the supposed portion of the Deity: it would have been unbecoming not to make it as savory as possible. Another physical reason was suggested to me by the late Mr. Street, which I shall give in his own words: "The salt made the fire " burn fast and clear. Cooks frequently throw salt on, to prepare a fire for broiling; and " common sea-weed, when dried, has the same effect."

Ver. 14. The learned reader will see, that in the rendering of this verse I have not scrupulously observed the order of the Hebrew, in which the words גֶּרֶשׁ כֶּרֶם follow בָּאֵשׁ קָלִי, which obliged our English translators to insert the word *even*. By transposing them to their proper place, according to our idiom, the expletive is rendered unnecessary.—I have rendered גֶּרֶשׁ, *rubbed out*, not *beaten out*, because I believe the word has never this last signification; although it was so understood by Sep. and Jerom, the former having *επιτριβει*, the latter *confringes*. The other ant. versions have, by their Latin translators, been made to speak the same language; but, for the most part, falsely; for, neither the פֶּרֶק of Onk. nor the גֶּרֶשׁ of Saad. nor the מֶרֶשׁ of Erp. have, certainly, that signification: on the contrary, I am persuaded that they all convey the idea of *friction*, not of *confusion*; as well as the פֶּרֶק of Syr. which his translator has properly rendered *frictas* †.—The Sam. ver. has גֶּרֶשׁ, the Heb. גֶּרֶשׁ, which his Latin translator not badly renders *absque gluma*; i. e. rubbed out of its husk.—I cannot think, then, that גֶּרֶשׁ signifies *comminutum*, *pounded small*; yet celebrated modern critics have not only adopted that interpretation, but improved upon it, by rendering the next word כֶּרֶם, *sicut arenam*, making it a compound of the prefix כ and רֶם, which in Arab. signifies *sand*: so that, according to them, the parched ears were pounded as small as sand: *comminuta instar arenæ*. So Michaëlis and Rosenmüller, who force the Syr. translator into their service, because, after the word פֶּרֶק, he adds מֶרֶשׁ, as if this word were derived from the Heb. דָּכַר, or the Chald. דָּכָא ‡. With the good leave of these critics, I will venture to say that the

* "Sed aliena est hæc explicatio a contextu, ubi non queritur, num in fœdere sal sit adhibitus; sed cur sal, in omnibus oblationibus adhibendus, *sal fœderis divini dicatur*?" † The Latin *frico* is, I doubt not, from the same root.

‡ "Ita etiam sine dubio Syrus hoc vocabulum interpretatus est: habet enim מֶרֶשׁ, quod cum Michaëlis ad. דָּכָא *pulvis* referre et hinc vertere malim *pulveris in modo comminuta*. Nam significatio spicæ viridis, quam voci כֶּרֶם vulgò tribuunt, non potest probari, et planè precariè adsumpta est." Rosenmüller in loc.

Syr. version cannot bear such a meaning, and that מִדְּכָתָם is well translated in the Polyglott *purgatus*. Michaëlis, in his edition of Castell's Syr. Lexicon, has taken for granted, but has not proved, that ever דְּכָת in that language signifies *sand*, or indeed in any other dialect. In Chald. indeed, it has sometimes the same meaning as the Heb. דָּכָה and דָּכָךְ; but even then it could only correspond with the word כִּרְשׁ, and not with כִּרְסָל. But there is not a single example, I believe, where, in the Syr. דְּכָת has any other meaning than that of *pure, clean, purified*, &c. What Michaëlis adds with respect to the Syr. version is a mistake: "*Spicæ frictæ, quas Biblia habent Polyglotta, ex consueta sumptæ Hebraici כִּרְסָל interpretatione: vocabulum certè Syriacum vix potest spicas significare.*"—But it is not the word כִּרְסָל, which in Pol. is rendered *spicas frictas*, but, the word before it, פְּרִיכָתָם; the former being rendered *purgatus*; not so improperly, perhaps, as may at first sight appear.

For, to proceed to the explication of כִּרְסָל, which is commonly placed by Lexicographers among the quadriliteral radicals, but which Michaëlis would make a compound of כ and רסל, it is certainly not easy to say what is its real etymon or its precise signification, although it occurs, either as a proper name or as an appellative, at least forty times. As a proper name, it is thus explained by Origen *ἐπιστήμη περιτομῆς*, by Jerom rendered *scientia circumcissionis*: a most ridiculous etymon.—Simonis: *arvum viride*, "the green field;" so called from "the verdant meadows which surrounded it:" but he ventures not to analyse the word, considering it, no doubt, as a radical.—As an appellative, it may sometimes have the same meaning, as in Isaiah, 16. 10.—29. 17.—32. 15, 16.; and in Jerem. 4. 26.—48. 33.; and in some other places, where our common version has *a fruitful field, a fruitful place, a plentiful field*, which rendering shall be appreciated in the proper places. But here, and again in ch. 23. 14. it cannot possibly have any such meaning. The last quoted text runs thus: לֶחֶם וְקֹלֵי וְכִרְסָל; rendered in our common version, after Pagninus: "And ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor green ears, &c." I do not think that *green ears* expresses the full meaning of כִּרְסָל: but what a figure would Michaëlis's interpretation, *as sand*, make here!—I wonder that this passage did not lead him to see the absurdity of his rash conjecture.

But what, then, is the precise meaning, and what the genuine etymon, of כִּרְסָל?—I am sorry to say, that the answers which I have to give to these queries are not quite satisfactory to myself; I will give them, however, and leave the critical reader to judge. In the first place, it is clear, I think, that the word relates to some *quality* of ears of corn; but whether it denote their *greenness*, or their *fulness*, or their *selection*, it is not quite so certain.—I then take כִּרְסָל to be the radical word, and seek its primitive meaning in the Arabic, where it frequently occurs, and in various significations, but which are all, I think, reducible to one general idea, *generous, liberal, precious, excellent in kind*. It is particularly used to denote a *generous fertile soil*; *bona fecunda terra, terra egregias plantas producens, segete sincerâ egregia*, &c. Hence, no doubt, כִּרְסָל, the name of a vineyard both in Heb. and Arab.; and in the latter כִּרְסָלָה is the *generous vine* itself. But it is equally applicable to any other *generous* plant or vegetable, and consequently to *generous, plump, well-filled ears of corn*: and it was out of such ears that the Israelites are here ordered to rub out the oblation which was to be offered to the Lord. But how came the *lamed* to be added? As an augmentative, I conceive, standing in lieu of אל.

מל. Hence *Carmel*, as a proper name, will signify *the vineyard of God*, or any other spot of *generous* earth deserving of such an epithet; which agrees perfectly both with the mountain and the city of that name*. By a like hyperbolé, the plain of the Jordan, before the destruction of Sodom, is said to have resembled a *divine paradise, or garden of the Lord*: כן ידמה †.

The above, I think, is the true etymon of כרמל: and its meaning here seems to be *choice, full, plump, generous*, according to the primitive meaning of כרם.—Some future critic, perhaps, will deem my conjecture as rash and absurd as I have called that of Michaelis. Well; let him find a better etymon, and a more applicable signification.

CHAP. III.

Ver. 5. THIS verse is incomplete in all the copies and versions, except Sep.; I mean Rom. Alex. Canon. and the Coptic version; for the other copies which I have seen are more or less defective, but none so much so as the present text. The last comma, *ἐν τῷ θυμιατῷ*, “on the altar,” is wanting in Glasg. Leipf. Oxon. and in the Compl. and Ald. editions.—For the rest, one of De Rossi’s mss. has חכמים, “the priests,” after Aaron; and so Syr. ‡.—Saadias has a singular reading of the whole verse: “And a priest shall burn it on the altar, as a sweet-savoured sacrifice to the Lord §.”

Ver. 8. It is clear, I think, that the words וידד and פרה, or, at least, לפני ידד, have been dropped out of the Text. One ms. has the two latter words instead of לפני גדל סעד; and there is a vestige of such a reading in some Gr. mss. which have κατὰ προσηκόν ἐν ταῖς θυραῖς, κ. τ. λ.—But I am persuaded the true reading has been preserved by Syr. which I have expressed in my version.

Ver. 9. This, I think, is evidently a medicinal precept. “Bilious disorders are very frequent in hot countries: the eating of fat meat is a great encouragement and excitement to them. The fat of the large tail of the eastern sheep is reckoned a luxurious delicacy; but I have been told, by one who had eaten of it, that it is not wholesome.” MS. note of Mr. Street.—To this I can bear a personal testimony: one ounce of fat, eaten at any time, would go near to kill me; and I am convinced that most of bilious, and many other bodily disorders, are owing to the use of fat meats.—Of the same nature is the precept in

Ver. 17. Where blood is forbidden to be eaten: “Quod interdictum,” says Rosenmüller, “sine dubio respiciebat ad valetudinem in Orientalibus illis regionibus, in quibus sanguis citius in putredinem abit, ideoque in cibum noxior est, quam in nostris Septentrionalibus regionibus.”—The subject is well handled in Michaelis’s *Mosaisches Recht*, part iv. sect. 206, p. 215, of the second edition.

* “Carmelus est totus viridis, plenus arboribus, in vertice quidem pinis et quercubus, ad radices verò olivis et lauris. In medio monte est locus amoenissimus, nemoribus plenus, qui creditur esse *saltus Carmeli*.” Philip. a S. Trin. in *Itiner. Orient.* apud Simonis. See more on this matter in C. R. 2 Kings, 19. 23. † The original reading was, probably, בן אלהים; which was read by Sep. and Syr. ‡ But in the Ambrosian Estrangelian ms. this addition is wanting. See De Rossi. § וקטר דמן אלמאמא עלי אלמורבח קרמאמא סקבלא מרמא ער אללה.

C H A P. IV.

Ver. 1: DATHE and Rosenmüller think that some words are evidently wanting at the end of this verse, namely, *let him expiate his sin by a sacrifice* *: but there is no vestige of such a supplement in any text or version; nor is it, indeed, in the least necessary. It is quite in the Scripture style, first to put a general condition, and then to apply it to individuals. So, in any other language, a legislator might say to a nation: "If any of you commit such and such a crime, and if that person be of such a rank, &c. let him be punished thus; if of such another rank, let him be punished thus." It would be useless, it would be frigid, to add, after the first comma, "Let him be punished."—I am willing to admit that many mutilations have been made in the text, through the negligence of transcribers; but most of them may be restored by the authority of MSS. or of the ancient versions, and sometimes, although rarely, by analogy and critical conjecture, especially where the mutilation is only a single letter or word; but we are not to suppose the mutilation of whole phrases, without very cogent, evidently cogent, reasons.—The addition in

Ver. 7. of נָשָׂא is more reasonable, both because it is in P. Y. ch. 5. 9. and expressed in the Latin and Arabic versions; yet I would not say that it was ever in the original text. It is equally wanting in the Sam. copies, in Sep. Syr. Onk. Tharg. Perf. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. I would not therefore insert it in the text, but would have no scruple in putting it in a translation, because it is evidently implied in the text; and this it was, I have no doubt, that made Jerom and Saadias supply it in theirs. Le Clerc and Rosenmüller employ an odd sort of argument to justify the insertion of נָשָׂא. "Nam *omnis* absolute non potest dici, quum una sanguinis pars in sanctuario adpersa fuerit." But, surely, they were not ignorant that כֹּל in the Hebrew idiom, often, very often indeed, denotes only the *greater part* of a thing, and not an absolute totality. The quantity of blood which was sprinkled in the sanctuary was so small, that the remainder might, without any impropriety, be called *the whole*. The same phrase is repeated in ver. 18, without any variety of lection, save that Vulg. and Saad. supply *the rest*, as here.

Ver. 15. *And the steer being slaughtered.* Delgado has a very proper remark on this place: "Our common version has, *And the bullock (bull) shall be killed*; this is right, and so it should be rendered in all other places, where the English translator translates it *and he shall kill*; for it is no matter who kills the beast; so that they (he means the word שָׁח where it occurs) are all impersonal."

Ver. 17. There is some variety of lection in this verse, but of little importance. I have followed Sam. Sep. and 1 Ms. and adopt Rosenmüller's remark: "Totus hic locus emendandus videtur ad ver. 6, ubi eadem formula. Solet enim Moses, ubi de eadem re loquitur, una eademque verba retinere."

* "Hoc enim supplendum esse, manifestè docent quæ sequuntur. Nec possunt pro *apodofi* haberi ultima verba ver. 3, quia hoc versu, non de omnibus Israelitis, sed tantum de pontifice maximo sermo est. Nostro ver. dicit legislator, omnium peccata per errorem commissa certis sacrificiis debere expiari: tum vv. seq. quid singulis sit faciendum, docet."

Ver. 22. *If it be a chief.* ראש. It means a person of *elevated* rank; chiefs of tribes, or other superior officers of state.

Ver. 29. *In the place || where the victims are slaughtered.* The present text has only בנסקם העלה; but Sam. has העלה את יסחזו אשר יסחזו בנסקם; and so Sep. α τῷ τοπῳ, ὅν, (or ὅ) σφαζοντα τα θλουτωματα. So also both Sam. versions, that in the Polyglott, and the Barbarini Sam.-Arab. ms. which has הנה אלהי יסחזו אליו יסחזו, in loco in quo mactant victimam. The same addition is found in one of Kennicott's Heb. mss. and is the marginal reading of one of De Rossi's*, with this difference only, that they read יסחזו העלה instead of העלה את יסחזו. — One of De Rossi's Chald. mss. and the Bab. Thalmud, have the same reading; and the latter has, with Sam. את before העלה. Another of De Rossi's manuscripts has an equivalent reading, but passively, העלה יסחזו, *let the victim be slaughtered.* Such seems to have been the reading of Syr. and so read the Heb. and Sam. text, ch. 6. 18, al. 25†, without any variety of lection in the copies of either; although, there also, the Septuagint read actively in the plural σφαζονσι. Both readings are of the same import.

Ver. 31. *A sweet-favoured burnt-offering.* In the present texts there is nothing for *burnt-offering*, and therefore I have put it in Italics; although, in such cases, it is always implied. One of Kennicott's mss. has על אש; a vestige, possibly, of עלה אשה: and the Syr. translator seems to have found עלה, at least, in his copy, as he has קורבנא למריא.

Ver. 33. [*As a sin-offering.*] לחטאת. So both texts, and all the versions except Sep.; I mean Vat. Alex. Glasg. and Copt.; for the Complutensian edition has περι της αμαρτιας ‡ after ταυτο; and Ald. with mss. Sar. Leipf. Canon. have περι αμαρτιας; yet it has much the air of an interpolation, and I have accordingly put it within brackets.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 1. THIS verse is variously rendered and variously understood. Sep. thus: Εαν δε ψυχη αμαρτη, και ακουση φωνην ορκισμου, και οντος μαρτυς, η εξωρακεν η συνιοδεν, εαν μη π αγγελιη, ληψεται την αμαρτιαν.—Vulg. Si peccaverit anima, et audierit vocem jurantis, testisque fuerit, quod aut ipse vidit, aut conscius est: nisi indicaverit, portabit iniquitatem suam. And so equivalently, and ambiguously, all the ant. translators, except Saadias, who, to me, seems to have well understood the meaning of his original. It is not here question of informing against a swearer, as Houbigant and others have imagined; nor does it relate to the witness who has been adjured to tell the truth, as Michaëlis, Dathe, Schulz, and Rosenmüller, after Jarhi, understand the text; but either to him who, having heard another person give an oath, neglects to give his testimony against it if he know it to be false; or who, having heard the words of a public

* The famous ms. that belonged to the late Pope, and which has many other valuable readings. See De Rossi's *Dissertation* on it, and his *Var. Readings*.

† In the common division of chapters, ch. 5 has only 19 verses: but ch. 6 has 30 verses; and, in the Polyglott, not only all the versions, but the Heb. text itself, is thus divided; and so it is in the editions of Plantin. But in the mss. and in the editions of Bomberg, Athias, and Vanderhooght, followed by Kennicott, ch. 5 has 26 verses, but ch. 6 has 26. I have followed this division for the sake of reference; but, when I have had occasion to quote, noted the other by an *alias*. See Explan. Note on ver. 20, vol. i. p. 186.

‡ In Bos 175 is omitted.

adjuration, made for the purpose of discovering some fact, like an episcopal monitory, neglects to come forward, in consequence, with his testimony to what he knows on the subject.—This last opinion is adopted and well explained by Delgado: “The meaning is,” says he, “that when evidences are wanted, the judges order a proclamation to be issued for any one who knows any thing concerning it to come and declare it in court; and commonly a curse is joined to it in case any should neglect or refuse to be evidence. Now this man’s sin is, that he heard the proclamation, and yet did not appear to give evidence.”—This is certainly a very rational interpretation, and I think the true one. *The voice of swearing*, then, in our Vulg. version, is improper; but the *φωνὴ ὀρκισμοῦ* of Sep. is perfectly right.

Ver. 6. *His guilt-offering.* אָשַׁם, גֹּחַלְתָּו. Hence Michaëlis and others have supposed that the sins mentioned in this chapter are sins of *omission*, as those mentioned in the former are sins of *commission*. But this distinction appears to be arbitrary; for in the preceding chapter likewise, ver. 3, the sin is called אָשַׁם; and in Gen. 26. 10. Abimelech reproaches Isaac for having, by a lie, exposed his wife to be abused; whence guilt, אָשַׁם, might have been incurred. Surely this *guilt* would not have been a sin of *omission*. So in Levit. 6. 5, 6. the sin is called אָשַׁם, and the sin-offering אָשָׁם; although the sin, for which it is offered, be a positive lie, accompanied with an act of injustice. But is there no difference then between חַטָּאת and אָשַׁם? One would think there were; yet it is difficult to say in what it consists. The Thalmudists say that אָשַׁם was a *doubtful guilt*: I should be apt to think that it was a sin of *criminal carelessness*, and in that distinguished from sins of *ignorance* and *inadvertence*.

Ver. 7. *If he cannot afford a sheep, let him bring either two turtle-doves or two pigeons.* Pigeons were so plentiful in Palestine and the neighbouring countries, that he must have been poor indeed who could not afford a pair. Adrichomius tells us, that there was a single tower to the south of Jerusalem in which 5000 doves nested. See also Maundrel’s *Journey from Jerusalem to Aleppo*; and Harmer. vol. i. observ. 28, p. 222.

Ver. 15. *Of the value of two shekels.* The Heb. is בְּעֶרְכָּךְ כֶּסֶף שְׁקָלִים, in our common version rendered, “with thy estimation by shekels of silver;” as if the value of the sheep were to be estimated—by whom? By Moses, says Rosenmüller. Then the precept could not be a permanent one. Yea, when Moses died, the right fell to the magistrates.—Le Clerc supplies thus: “Pro estimatione tua,” *O sacerdos!*—But, as Houbigant justly observes, the words are directed neither to Moses nor to the priest, but to the people of Israel, through the mediation of Moses; and Houbigant’s argument against Le Clerc, in favour of the ant. versions, appear to me unanswerable*. In fact, all the ancient versions, save Perf. and Gr. Ven. even the very literal Arab. Erp. have nothing equivalent to *thy*. Sep. *τιμὴς αἰγνῶν σιμλα*—Vulg. *qui emi potest duobus fclis*—So Onk.: בְּפִרְסָנִי, *estimatione*—Tharg. בְּעִלְיָהּ, *estimatione*—Syr. בְּדִסְיָא, *pretio*—Saad. בְּקִסְתָּהּ, *pretio*—Arab. Erp. בְּתִקְיָהּ, *estimatione*.—All suppose that the ram was to be estimated at not less than two shekels of silver; for that שְׁקָלִים is here in the dual number, is evident from the whole context. But, say Rosenmüller and others, if this were the meaning, the בְּעֶרְכָּךְ, *ex estimatione tua*, would be superfluous. It would so, if it were so

* See his Note on this verse, and that on ch. 27. 1. too long to be here inserted.

to be rendered; but not so, as the antients have rendered it, and as the sense of the whole passage obliged them to render it. Did they then read בערך in their copies of the text? *—Most probably they did, as both the Sam. and Heb. copies all so read. But they did not think that the final ך in the בערך should be rendered *thy*. They either considered it as a *paralogical* or *emphatical* letter, as Houbigant will have it to be; or, as I think, a mere Hebraism, like, *As thou goest to Egypt, as thou comest to Gerar*, and an hundred similar modes of phrasing, which we commonly render *impersonally*, as *one cometh*, as *one goeth*. So that, even granting the final ך to be here a suffix, and not an emphatic, I see no reason why we should express it in English. The meaning is, that the ram must be worth two shekels, as nearly as his value can be estimated. Every other interpretation appears to me to be repugnant to the context and the scope of the legislator.—Of a different opinion, however, are Michaëlis, Dathe, Schulz, and Hezel, who amends Luther's excellent version thus: Besser: "werth du (Moses) nach silberseckeln, und zwar nach seckeln des heilighthums, vorschreibest, bestimmest;" partly borrowed from Michaëlis.—Dathe thus: "Cujus pretium ex ficlis argenteis, in rebus sacris usitatis, definit."

Ver. 17. I have said, in Explan. Note, that, if this be not an interpolation from ch. 4. 27. it must be restricted to such inadvertent transgressions as respected sacred things; which seems to be confirmed by the conclusion of ver. 19. Or, perhaps, the negative לא has been misplaced, and ought to be read before עשית in the first comma of the verse; so that the colon should run thus: *וְלֹא עֲשִׂיתָ אֶחָד מִכָּל מִצְוַת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה*; and this is the order in which the words are arranged by Michaëlis and Rosenmüller†. Yet I doubt of the propriety of this arrangement. All the antients, down to Gr. Ven. read as we now do; nor is there any variety of lection in either text, save that two of Kennicott's mss. want לא after אֲשֶׁר; but have it not, where Michaëlis would place it, before עשית; and, indeed, this collocation appears to me to be awkward and uncouth, and I doubt if such another phrase is to be found in the Heb. volumes. We must, then, either suppose the verse to be interpolated from ch. 4. 27. which I am not willing to allow, or say that the case here differs from the case there in this, that the latter regards common sins, where *sacred* things are not concerned; but that the former relates to a transgression with respect to those precepts that relate to divine worship, or any thing belonging to it; as it seems clear from ver. 15. Hence a more costly guilt-offering is required.—Dathe's version is: *Si quis peccatum commiserit, in ullo aliquo eorum, quæ lege divinâ interdicta sunt, neque hoc intellexerit, &c.*

Ver. 21. (In our common version ch. 6. 2.) *A deposit.* תְּשׁוּמַת יָד. Lit. *depositio manus*;

* I once conjectured that the original reading might have been בערך כִּכְהָן שְׂקִלֹה, and that the first *cap* in כִּכְהָן might have been afterwards disjoined from it, and added to בערך; but this must have happened to a Sam. copy, or to an Heb. one before the introduction of final letters.

† "Si communem lectionem sequimur, oritur inexplicabilis difficultas. Capite enim proxime antecedenti, ver. 28. 32. dixerat Moses, *Si quis privatus peccatum commiserit contra præcepta* וְהִעֲשִׂיתָ, אֲשֶׁר לֹא וְהִעֲשִׂיתָ, (id vero est *peccatum commissionis*) offerendam esse *capellam* aut *ovem femellam*: ex lectione vero recepta idem Moses, hoc loco, pro peccato *commissionis arietem* integrum jubet: et ita sibi aperte contradicit. Optimè hæc difficultas tollitur per conjecturam Michaëlis, qui לא inter verba וְהִעֲשִׂיתָ et אֲשֶׁר delendum, et ante עֲשִׂיתָ in prioris hujus commatis membro ponendum putat. Ita etiam manet discrimen, quod supra inter תְּשׁוּמַת יָד et אֲשֶׁר constituemus, et quod etiam infra, ver. 21, 22, locum habet."

in our English translation rendered *fellowship*. So Sep. *περι κοινωνίας*; and so equivalently most of the ant. versions. But Jerom took it to be only an explanation of the preceding word, as he renders—*depositum, quod fidei ejus creditum fuerit*.—The Greek of Venice has a very singular version: *ἐξόλη* (for *ἐμβόλη*) *χειρός*.—I see no reason to depart from the radical meaning of *שׁוּב*; and Bate, I think, has well rendered the words, “about any thing lodged “in his hand;” that is, any *deposit*, properly so called. In this sense it is not quite the same with *פָּקָד*; this latter denoting any *trust* or *charge* whatever, the former a real *deposit*, *in manus traditum*. So Schulz and Dathe; but Michaëlis and Rosenmüller adopt the other opinion.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 13. al. 20. *ON the day in which he or they shall be anointed.* בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה יִשָּׁחֲטוּ. Sep. *עַל הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, וְהָיָה חֵטְאָם*. Vulg. more literally, *in die unctionis sue*. So equivalently all the antient versions except Saadiah, who has *מִיּוֹם הַזֶּה*, *from the day*, &c.; but Erp. *בַּיּוֹם*, with the rest; and Gr. Ven. *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ χρίσθαι ἑ*. So, generally, even the latest modern interpreters. But Rosenmüller thinks that *ב* is here equivalent to *מ*, and that we should render *from the day in which*, &c. as the Arabic translator understood it*; and that the precept relates to the daily sacrifice which the high-priests were obliged to make from the time of their consecration. That *ב* may sometimes, not often, be rendered *from*, without detriment to the meaning of the text, I allow; but I believe it is, even in those places, never to be confounded with *מ*, and may in every one of them retain its own proper signification. All the instances in Noldius are resolvable into *in*, *on*, or *by*; the two selected by Rosenmüller not excepted—Exod. 12. 15. and Jud. 10. 8. In both places the *ב* marks the period *when*, and not the period *from which*: yet, in most of these places, we may render *from*, as I myself have done in Exod. But here I doubt much if we can take that liberty, as there is no *terminus ad quem* mentioned in the text. Much stronger is his argument drawn from the testimony of Josephus, who says that the priest was wont to offer, daily, out of his own property, a certain quantity of flour mixed with oil, baked a little, and divided into two parts, one of which he threw into the sacred fire in the morning, the other in the evening†. This is certainly very similar to the priest's *donative* in Exodus; yet I have still some doubt of its being the same, and think that, in that case, the precept would have been expressed in other terms; at the same time acknowledging, that the conjecture of Rosenmüller is highly probable.

Ver. 21. *If the vessel in which it is cooked be of earth, it shall be broken; if of copper, it shall be scoured.* I shall here only give Rosenmüller's note, with a single remark on it.—“*Moses* “*vasis æneis magis favet, quam testaceis, id quod nobis periculosum videri possit, quum vasa* “*ænea faciliè æruginè induci soleant. Sed hoc periculum verendum non est, ubi vasa illa*

* “*Mallè vertere a die unctionis, atque hæc verba intelligere de sacrificio sacerdotum, quod ipsi inde a die unctionis* “*sunt quotidie mane et vespere offerre debuerunt.* † *Θυει δὲ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀγαλμάτων, καὶ δις ἑκάστης* “*ἡμέρας τούτου ποιεῖ, ἀλευρὸν ἐλαιῷ μεμιγμένον (al. μεμιγμένον), καὶ πύργος στήθει βραχεία . . . τούτου δὲ τοῦ μὲν* “*ἡμῶν πρῶτῃ, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον δειλῆς ἐπιφέρει τῷ πυρὶ.* Ant. l. iii. c. 10. n. 7. p. 180.

"frequenter defricantur et aqua eluuntur, utpote populo jam ex legibus Religionis munditie adueto."—Tinned copper vessels were not known to our ancestors, and ~~was~~ yet unknown in some parts of the ~~islands~~; but great care is taken to scrub the inside of copper and brass pans and kettles with sand and straw, and then to wash them clean with water; so that ~~scarcely~~ any inconvenience happens from the use of them. A reason why Moses ordered the earthenware to be broken, and the copper vessels to be scoured, might be the superior intrinsic value of the latter. It ~~would have been~~ bad economy to destroy every copper vessel that had been defiled, when it could so readily be scoured from the impurity.

C H A P. VII.

THIS chap. in Sep. begins at ch. vii. ver. 11. except in Compl. which follows the Heb. division.

Ver. 13. *With these, and with leavened bread besides, shall he offer his eucharistic sacrifice.*—No part of this leavened bread was to be offered on the altar; it was only, like the first-fruits, a donation to the priests.

Ver. 15. The precept contained in this and the three following verses seems to have had two ends in view—to promote health and encourage liberality. On the third day the meat would be stale, and consequently unwholesome; and by being obliged to eat all on the first or second day, the poor would more readily come in for their share.

Ver. 19. *Nor shall any person eat of the flesh who is not clean.* There is here an apparent obscurity in the original which runs thus: חֲבֵשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר יֵנֶע בְּכֹל טָמֵא לֹא יֵאָכֵל בָּשָׂר יִשְׂרָאֵל יִדְבֹשֶׁר; כֹּל טָמֵא יֵאָכֵל בָּשֶׁר; thus rendered in our common version—"And the flesh that toucheth any unclean thing shall not be eaten, it shall be burned with fire: and as for the flesh, all that be clean shall eat thereof." Instead of "thereof," the original repeats *flesh* thus—"And the flesh, every clean person shall eat flesh:" or, if the reader like better Montanus's Latin, *et carnem, omnis mundus comedet carnem*. Sep. more briefly, πᾶς καθᾶρος φάσκειται κρέας. Did they read בָּשֶׁר only once? or did they suppress one?—Both are in the Heb. and Sam. texts, with very little variety of lection*; and indeed, in some shape or other, in all the ant. versions, save Sep. The Greek of Venice is as literal as Montanus himself: καὶ τὸ κρέας, πᾶς καθᾶρος ἐδέσκειται κρέας. But what *flesh* is here meant? Not surely the same flesh that was just before ordered to be burned! Yet Jerom seems to have thought so; if his text have not been corrupted, as he renders the whole verse thus: "*Caro, quæ aliquid tetigerit immundum, non comedetur, sed comburetur igni: qui fuerit mundus, vescetur ex ea*:" rendered by the Douay translators—"The flesh that hath touched any unclean thing shall not be eaten, but shall be burnt with fire: he that is clean shall eat thereof." This last word Dr. Chaloner changed into "of it," with the following note; "that is, of the flesh of the thanksgiving."—This is indeed the explication which is given by Onkelos and the Thargumists, and almost all com-

* In one ms. חֲבֵשֶׁר is wanting, in another it is without the copulative, and in another without the prefix ה. One ms. has כל דובש; and another, still more pleonastically, דובש כל בשר.

mentators; but this idea is very badly expressed in the Latin Vulg.; and, even in the original, it is far from being clearly conveyed.

It was this that led Michaëlis to think that the order has been altered, and that we should thus restore it: בָּשָׂר יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַבֶּשֶׂר: ver. 20. וְהַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר, &c. The letters are all the same, only two copulatives have changed their places, and ver. 19 is supposed to end with וְהַבֶּשֶׂר. On this idea Michaëlis has formed his German version thus: "Wenn opferfleisch von etwas unreinem berührt würde, so soll es nicht gegessen, sondern verbrannt werden. Jeder reine kann vom fleisch des opfers essen: wer aber, &c."—This emendation of the text is ingenious without being violent; yet to me it appears, in some degree, exceptionable; for, first, it will be allowed, I think, that יִשְׂרָאֵל is here more idiomatical than יִשְׂרָאֵל, especially as יִשְׂרָאֵל, not יִשְׂרָאֵל, immediately precedes: secondly, if we point after וְהַבֶּשֶׂר, and refer it to the *flesh* that was to be burned, it is a very uncommon construction. We should, in that supposition, have expected to find וְהָאֵשׁ after it. I am, therefore, prone to think that בָּשָׂר, at the end of ver. 19. is an early interpolation; and that the 19th verse should end with יִשְׂרָאֵל. וְהַבֶּשֶׂר will then be naturally referred to the בָּשָׂר זָכוֹה of ver. 18, and as naturally connected with ver. 20.—At any rate, either the וְהַבֶּשֶׂר or the בָּשָׂר of ver. 19 must necessarily be referred to the flesh of the sacrifice itself, and not to that part of it which, from being defiled, was to be burned.

Ver. 21. *Or any unclean reptile.* The present text has כָּל שֶׂקֶץ; but the true reading seems to be כָּל שֶׂרֶץ, which is that of the Sam. text and version, and of 7 Heb. mss. followed by Syr. Onk. Tharg. and Saad. and preferred by Houbigant and Michaëlis to the other reading; which, however, is that of Sep. Vulg. Perf. Arab. Erp. * and Gr. Ven.: yet שֶׂקֶץ כֹּסֵם looks so like a tautology †, that one is apt to think it could not be the original reading.

Ver. 24. *Ye shall eat none of the fat.* This precept must be limited. It refers only to such parts of the fat as were to be offered to the Lord, as is explained ver. 25.

Ver. 35. *Such was the portion, &c.* I consider this as a part of the historical narrative, and not of the foregoing injunction. For the rest, the word which I render *portion*, מַשְׁכּוֹת, is by Sep. rendered *χαρις*, by Vulg. *unctio*; and so equivalently by all the antients, save Saadias, who, from his intimate acquaintance with the Arabic dialect, saw that such a rendering was here unsuitable, and has very properly translated חֶזֶק וְחֵן וְהָאֵשׁ. In fact, not only in Arab. but in Syr. Chald. and Sam. the word signifies a *measure*, or *portion*; and, perhaps, even in Heb. *unctio* is but a secondary meaning of מַשְׁכּוֹת. However this be, it is here an improper meaning; as is clear from Num. 18. 8. where the Lord says to Aaron: "To thee also I give the charge of mine heave-offerings, out of all the hallowed offerings of the children of Israel: as an honorary portion, לְמַשְׁכּוֹת, I give them to thee:" where the Septuagint themselves render לְמַשְׁכּוֹת by *εὐχάρις*. Here indeed Saadias has מַשְׁכּוֹת; but, I am persuaded, in the same sense with חֶזֶק, which he uses in Exodus, although his Latin translator has *ad unctioem*. In both places we might render *prerogative*; or, as Houbigant, *right, jus*.—Michaëlis has "theil," *share, portion, or dole*, still used in poetry. Dathe, more etymologically, *pars dimensa*.

* By mistake classed in my Var. Read. with those who read שֶׂרֶץ; in lieu of which insert Tharg.
words never elsewhere meet.

† The two

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 3. ~~CONVOKE~~ *the whole assembly.* כל העדה. Sep. *πᾶσαν τὴν συνήλην*—Vulg. *convocatum.* We are not however to imagine that this means the whole people of Israel, but only their deputies and representatives; a real select senate, or parliament. See Michaëlis's excellent dissertation on this subject, in the first vol. of his *Mosaïsches Recht*, sect. 45. p. 258 of the second edition.

Ver. 7, 8. The order, I think, has been somewhat deranged. By the aid of three mss. and P. P. Exod. 29. 5, 6. I would thus restore it—ויתן עליו את הכיתנת' ויחגור אותו באבנט' וילבש אותו. את המעיל ויתן עליו את המעפר ואת החשן' ויתג' אותו בחשב המעפר' ויתן אל חושן את האורים ואת התומים.—This order I have followed in my version; but, that my reader may have also the present order before him, I shall here give it in the words of our common translation: "And he put upon him the coat, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod upon him; and he girded him with the curious girdle of the ephod, and bound it unto him therewith. And he put the breast-plate upon him: also he put upon the breast-plate the Urim and Thummim."—The principal mistranslations here have been elsewhere noticed*; I will only add, that the *עליו* before *המעפר* in ver. 7, should, in my opinion, be rendered, not *upon him*, but *upon it*; i. e. *over the ephod*, as Jerom has well expressed it—*et desuper humerale imposuit.*

Ver. 33. *From the door of the convention-tent ye shall not depart, &c.* "Not the door of the tabernacle," say Dathe and Rosenmüller, "but the door of the court."—Why so?—"Because it was not permitted for the priests to sleep, nor even sit down, within the tabernacle."—True; but they who watched *at the door*, and not within the door, could not be said either to sit or sleep in the tabernacle; they were to remain, not at the door of the court, but in the court, at the door of the tabernacle, during the seven days of their initiation.

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 24. *NOW the glory of the Lord had appeared.* וירא כבוד יהוה. I render *ירא* in the preterperfect tense, because the appearance, no doubt, was made when the first holocaust was burned, and before Aaron came down from the altar. Many things in the Hebrew volumes are related not just in their proper place, as every scholar knows.

* See C. R. on Exod. 28. 8.

C H A P. X.

Ver. 2. *A FLAME emitted from the Lord*; that is, a flash of lightning. Ib. *Devoured them*. This word is too strong, as well as *consumed* in our common version. That they were not *consumed*, appears from ver. 4, where Mithael and Elizaphan are ordered to “carry them” out of the camp, from before the sanctuary.”

Ver. 9. *Neither wine, nor any thing inebriating*. ויין ושכר. Sep. ουν και σικερα *—Vulg. *vinum, et omne quod inebriare potest*: and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. Saad. Peri.—Syr. and Erp. retain the Heb. and Greek word, σικερα.—From Herodotus † we learn that the Egyptians, instead of wine, which their country produced not, made a strong drink out of barley. The same thing is attested by Diodorus Siculus. Among the Jews, שכר was used to denote every sort of inebriating liquor, whether it were made out of grain, or the juice of fruits, or a composition of honey and water, which we call *mead* ‡.

Ver. 14. *In a clean place*. That is, in any place not defiled by any legal impurity.

C H A P. XI.

AS Spencer and Michaëlis have largely treated on the probable motives which induced the Hebrew legislator to enact the laws mentioned in this chapter, I shall say little on the subject. I shall only observe, that all nations have a natural aversion to the eating of some beasts and birds, and which in their eyes may be said to be unclean: and I believe there is not one in the Mosaic catalogue which any of us would eat without some great urgency §. It is not, indeed, easy to say what are the particular species here proscribed, and therefore the best I can do, I think, is to give, first, my own version, and then the Heb. Greek, Latin, and other corresponding names, with a few notes, where they seem necessary, at the bottom of the page.

UNCLEAN QUADRUPEDS.

Ver. 4. *The camel*. Heb. with both Arabs, גמל—Sep. and Gr. Ven. καμηλος—Vulg. *camelus*—Onk. Tharg. Syr. גמל—Perf. גמל.—There is no doubt of this being the *camel*, including the *dromedary*.

* Gr. Ven. σικερα. † Euterp. c. 76. ‡ “Cicera, hebraico sermone, omnis potio quæ inebriare potest; sive illa quæ frumento conficitur, sive pomorum succu, aut cum favi decoquantur in dulcem et barbaram potione, aut palmarum fructus exprimentur in liquore, costisque fragibus aqua pinguior coloratur.” Hieron. ad Nepot. Op. tom. 4. p. 364. ed. Bened.—So Theophylactus (ad Luc. i. v. 15) Σικερα λεγεται παν το μεθην εμποιων δυναμενον, εκ ου δε εχ' αμπελου.—See Suiceri *Tesaur. Ecclesiast.* tom. 11. p. 958.—Among the Arabs, כמר and מרמר seem chiefly to denote *date-wine*. § The remark of a Greek Father is here to the purpose: ‘Η κοινή φύσις πολλακις προλαβουσα [τον νομον] εδεδουξάτο τα μεν δια το μεγεθος, τα δε δια το δυσειδες, τα δε δια το νεκρων απογευσασθαι, τα δε κατα προληψιν μισους. Όσα ουκ προλαβεν η συνήθεια, ουκ ανετρεψεν ο νομος. Euseb. Emisen. In Caten. apud Montfaucon, vol. i. p. 120.

Ver. 5. *The bear-mouse.* Heb. and Tharg. שֵׁן—Sep. *δαρυμῶς**—Vulg. *chærogryllus*—Onk. שֵׁן †—Syr. *ܫܝܢ* ‡—Saad. *ܫܝܢ* §—Exp. *שֵׁן* ¶—Perf. *שֵׁן* ††—Gr. Ven. *εχμος*—Most modern translators have, after Pagninus and Luther, taken it to be the *rabbit*, or *coney*. So all our English translators, save those who translated from the Vulgate, namely, Wiclif, and the Douay translators, who retain the Latin word *chærogryll*.—That the שֵׁן cannot be the coney is now pretty generally agreed, both because the coney is not a ruminating animal, and because it dwells not in the rocks, as the שֵׁן is said to do, Psalm 104. 18. and Prov. 30. 26. the only other places where the word occurs, except in Deut. 14. 7. where it must have the same meaning as here. It is now generally believed to be the *mus-jaculus*, *pedibus posticis longissimis, cauda villosa*, thus described by Hasselquist: "This animal is of the size of a large mouse: it supports itself only on its hind legs, and therefore hops or jumps in its progressive motion. When it rests, it closes its feet to its belly, and sits on its knees bent. It holds its victuals with its fore feet or paws, as do the rest of this tribe. It is fond of sleep; sleeping in the day, and waking at night. It eats wheat, bread, and the seeds of sesamum. Though it is not much afraid of man, yet it is not easily tamed: for this reason it is always kept in a cage; and I have known one of these animals kept for some months, and even a year, in this manner, at Cairo. It is met with in Egypt, or between Egypt and Arabia. The Arabians call it *Garbuka*, [it should be *Ierbua*, *ירבוע*]: but the French who live in Egypt call it *Rat de Montagne* ¶."—Michælis renders it "die bergmaus mit langen hinterfüßen," *the mountain-mouse with long hinder-feet*; Dathe, *mus urfimus*; which I have adopted in my version.

Ver. 6. *The hare.* Heb. and Tharg. *ארנבה*—Sep. *αἰσχρογυλλίος***—Vulg. *lepus*—Onk. and Syr. *ארנבה*—Both Arabs, *ارنبه* ††—Perf. *ורכוש*—Gr. Ven. *λαγώς*.—All are agreed that this is the *hare*. It has been, indeed, objected, that the *hares* do not ruminate; but this is yet doubtful. At any rate they seem to ruminate, and this was sufficient for the Heb. legislator, who probably was not a great naturalist, like Solomon.

Ver. 7. *The swine.* Heb. *חזיר*—Sep. *ז*—Vulg. *fus*—Onk. Syr. and Tharg. *חזיר*—Both Arabs, *חזיר*—Perf. *חזק* (our very English *hog*)—Gr. Ven. *χαίμος*, a profane name for the same animal.—All allow that it is the *swine*, or, as we now term it, *hog*.

These are the only quadrupeds, which are specially named as unclean; but the general rule, in ver. 3. includes a vast number indeed; and therefore it was not necessary to mention them. Nor was it necessary to mention any particular fish, as a general rule is laid down

* So Ald. Vat. Alex. Glafg. Leipf. Canon.; but Compl. and ms. Sar. have here *αἰσχρογυλλίος*, and *δαρυμῶς* in the next verse, and this appears from Vulg. to have been the primitive order.

† This word denotes the *jumper*, and is commonly rendered *cuniculus*; but I believe it is the *mus jaculus*.

‡ Rendered in Pol. *cuniculus*, but by Ferrarius *bernaculus*.

§ Is thus described by Forskal: "Feli similis, sine cauda; herbiphagus, monticola. Cairo, incolis edulis."

¶ Gives also the notion of *jumping*. It is rendered by Walton *mustela*, *fovina*.

¶ Hasselquist, English version, p. 168. See also Bochart, Hieroz. pars i. l. 3. c. 33.; and Harmer, vol. iv. p. 166,

who is inclined to think that שֵׁן is the animal described by Shaw, called *Daman-Israel*.

** But here Compl. and ms. Sar. have *δαρυμῶς*. See the note on ver. 5.

†† It is written by Forskal *עירב*, with an *ain*; but *עירב* by Russel, who remarks that at Aleppo the *hare* and the *rabbit* are called by the same name. They are not forbidden to be eaten by the Mohammedan Arabs.

with respect to them in ver. 9—12. But a more particular specification was thought requisite of the birds, insects, and reptiles, that were to be accounted unclean.

UNCLEAN BIRDS.

Ver. 13. *The eagle.* Heb. נֶשֶׁךְ—Sep. and Gr. Ven. *aetos*—Vulg. *aquila*—Onk. and Syr. נֶשֶׁךְ—Tharg. נֶשֶׁךְ—Sam. ver. נֶשֶׁךְ—Both Arabs, נֶשֶׁךְ—Perf. נֶשֶׁךְ, rendered in Pol. *gryps*, but in the Perfic Gospel of Matthew it is put for the Greek *aetos*. It is certain that it is the *eagle*; but whether it denote the whole *aquiline* genus, or any particular species, it is hard to say.

Ib. *The vulture.* Heb. פֶּרֶס—Sep. גִּרְשִׁי *—Vulg. *gryps*—Onk. עֵר—Tharg. עֵר—Syr. עֵר—Sam. ver. עֵר—Both Arabs, עֵר—Perf. עֵר—Gr. Ven. *ἀλκις*—All the Oriental names seem to be derived from roots that signify *strength of body* or *strength of claws*, or *rapacity*; except the עֵר of Onk. which denotes *naked*, and leads us to that species of vulture called by Buffon *vultur fulvus*, of which there is a fine specimen, I think, in Parkinson's Museum.—In our common translation פֶּרֶס is rendered *offrage*, and by Dathe *offraga*; by Michaëlis, “der kleine schwarz-braune adler,” *the little black-brown eagle*.

Ib. *The osprey*, or rather *osprey*. Heb. עֵרֶב—Sep. *ἀλκις*—Vulg. *haliaetus*—Onk. עֵרֶב—Tharg. עֵרֶב—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. עֵרֶב—Both Arabs, עֵרֶב—Perf. עֵרֶב—Gr. Ven. γυψ. —Etymology leads to think that it derives its name from the *impetuosity* with which it seizes its prey: even the compound used by Jonathan, בֶּרֶךְ נֶחֱם, may be rendered *the son of festination*, from the meaning which נֶחֱם still retains in *Æthiopic*.—Our first English translators rendered it *cormorant*, our last *osprey*.—Dathe, *valeria*.—Michaëlis: “der meer-adler,” *the sea-eagle*.—All this, however, is but probable conjecture.

Ver. 14. *The falcon.* Heb. דָּחַף—Sep. גִּרְשִׁי—Vulg. *milvus*—Onk. דָּחַף—Tharg. דָּחַף—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. דָּחַף—Both Arabs, דָּחַף—Perf. דָּחַף—Gr. Ven. *ἄγριος*: he seems to have had the same idea with the Perfic translator.—All the other Oriental terms depend on the Heb. word דָּחַף or דָּחַף, which occurs only here and again in Deut. 14. 13. and in Isa. 34. 15. But as it occurs four times as a verb ὅ, and in all those places it evidently signifies to *fly swiftly* ||, it appears to me extremely probable that the *falcon* (*avis pernicissima*) is designated.—Our common version has *vulture*.—Dathe, *milvus*. Michaëlis, “der habicht,” *the falcon*.

Ib. *Kites, according to their kinds.* Heb. נָחִי—Sep. *ιατρός*, or *ιατρών*—Vulg. *vultur*—Onk. נָחִי—Tharg. נָחִי—Syr. *caret*—Sam. Ver. נָחִי—Both Arabs, נָחִי—Perf. נָחִי, *noctua*—Gr. Ven. *κόλας*.—From Hebrew etymology nothing is here to be learned. The Chaldee terms give only the general idea of *rapaciousness*, which perfectly agrees with the *kite*, who has been known to snatch fish out of the public markets, and even out of the hands of fish-women.

* All, save Alex. which hath גִּרְשִׁי. See the note on ver. 5.

† *Accipiter fringillarius*.

‡ The *fish-picker*.

§ Deut. 28. 49; PL 18. 10; Jerem. 48. 40. and 49. 22.

|| Particularly in that beautiful metaphor, Pl. 18. 10.:

“On a cherub he rode, and flew; he glided on wings of wind.”—From this same idea the falcon (at least one species of falcon) is called the *glide*; a term used by our English translators to express a word in Deut. written דָּחַף, but which I am persuaded should be נָחִי, as it is in Sam. and at least 3 Heb. mss. See C. R. on the place.

Hence

Hence Plautus, somewhere, calls a ravisher *mitvus*. The Syriac name denotes a bird of *great flight*; and this, too, suits the *kite*, who flies as high as any bird except the *falcon*, and balances himself in the air with greater ease than any other flying creature, the motion of his wings being hardly perceptible.

Ver. 15.* *Ravens of every kind*. Heb. and Sam. ver. ערב—Sep. and Gr. Ven. *καρβ*—Vulg. *omne corvini generis*—Onk. and Tharg. ערבא—Syr. נעבא—Saad. ערבא—Perf. כלמע—Erp. ערבא.—This is undoubtedly the *raven*. The Scottish name *corby*, the French *corbeau*, and the Latin *corvus*, are evidently derived from the Hebrew.

Ver. 16. *The ostrich*. Heb. בתדעסא—Sep. *στραβος*—Vulg. *strutio*—Onk. and Tharg. בתדעסא—Syr. נעסא—Sam. ver. ברתדעסא—Saad. נעסא—Erp. ברתדעסא—Perf. ברתדעסא—Gr. Ven. *καρβυρα*.—There is very little doubt of its being the *ostrich*. The Arabic *תאמא* is still, at Aleppo and in Barbary, the name for that bird. See Ruffel and Shaw†.

Ib. *The owl*. Heb. תוחס—Sep. *γλαυξ*—Vulg. *noctua*—Onk. תוחס—Tharg. תוחס—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. טעיה—Both Arabs, תוחס—Perf. תוחס—Gr. Ven. *κοταρακτις*.—It is very uncertain what bird this is. The Hebrew name implies only the general idea of *rapacity*: nor do the other Oriental names aid us to particularise the species. From the name given to it in Tharg. I was once inclined to think it might be the *snipe*, whose voice is well represented by חסית §; and the תוחס of Onk. seems to denote some clamorous bird, which the *snipe* is above all others; except, perhaps, the *lapwing*.—Dathc, *hirundo*—Michaëlis, “die eule||.”

Ib. *The horn-owl*. Heb. תוחס—Sep. *λαρος*—Vulg. *larus*—Onk. תוחס—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. תוחס—Both Arabs, תוחס—Perf. תוחס—Gr. Ven. *εφιαλτης*, *the night-mare*: a strange term indeed for a bird.—The Heb. word occurs only twice in an appellative sense, and in both places signifies *consumption*. In Chald. it has a similar meaning ¶, and the other Oriental terms here used to express the Hebrew name have a like import. But this well agrees with the *horn-owl*, who, although a great glutton, is perhaps the leanest of all birds. By our last English translators it is rendered cuckoo, but *sea-mew* by Gen. and *sea-gull* by Ainsworth. So Dathc, *larus*; and Michaëlis, “meeve;” all after the Septuagint and Vulgate. I am much inclined to think it is the *horn-owl*, and have so rendered it; yet one thing makes me doubt—Dr. Ruffel tells us, that, at Aleppo, תוחס is a hawk used in antelope and hare chasing. Now this word appears to be the same with תוחס, used by both Arabs to express the Heb. תוחס: and the Sam. ver. has a similar word, תוחס. Still all is conjecture; and perhaps it would be as well to stick to the good old Septuagint, and render *the sea-gull* **.

After *horn-owl*, in my version, is found *the bowlet*, which how it came in there, I hardly know; but I think it must have arisen from a doubt which I then had, whether תוחס meant

* In Sep. Ald. Rom. and Alex. this is ver. 16; but Compl. Glasg. Leipf. and Can. follow the order of the Hebrew.

† In our common version it is rendered the *owl*, but *ostrich* by our first translators.

‡ The *sparrow-hawk*.

§ *Hafit*, or *backfit*, is the common name of a snipe in the north of Scotland.

|| That is, the *owl*. In our common version it is the *night-hawk*.

¶ So the Arab. תוחס, among other meanings, has that of *thin*, *lean*, *emaciated*.

** Only it is not probable that a water-bird should be brought in among the land-birds of prey. The learned reader will examine, and choose.

the *howlet* or the *horn-owl*; and both, being marked in my *foul* copy, were inadvertently transcribed into the *fair* one. I am not, now, sure that *howlet* is not the preferable word, for the same etymological reasons are equally in its favour. The best way then to correct my text will be, to efface the *horn-owl*, and leave the marks of reference where they are. It is remarkable that the Sam. copies, both here and in Deut. have לְחֹרֶשׁ after שָׂרָף, and not after the next name, נָץ, as in Heb.

Ib. *Hawks of every kind*. Heb. נָץ—Sep. ἰσραξ—Vulg. *accipiter*—Onk. and Syr. נָץ—Tharg. and Sam. ver. נָץ—Both Arabs, نَارٍ—Perf. نَارٍ—Gr. Ven. *caret*.—It is pretty generally agreed that this is the *hawk*, but questioned of what particular species. This appears to me to be a needless question, when hawks of every sort are forbidden. The word נָץ then must be a generic term, and most probably signifies the *hawk*. Niebuhr indeed says that the Arabic word نَارٍ, or the Persian نَار, in Arabia, is at present the name for the *falcon*; but this is not sufficient to induce a belief that the Heb. word is to be so limited.

Ver. 17. *The cormorant*. Heb. and Tharg. כַּסְסִי—Sep. καττοραξ—Vulg. *bubo*—Onk. קַרְיָא—Syr. קַרְיָא—Sam. ver. קַרְיָא—Both Arabs and Perf. כַּסְסִי—Gr. Ven. γλαυξ.—In our com. ver. this is rendered *the swan*—by *Dathe otus*—by *Michaëlis nacht-rabe*.—Bochart thought it was the *onocrotalus*, or *bittourn*; and so Bate renders. I conjecture it to be *the cormorant*; yet the Arabic and Persian names stagger me. Ruffel says, that, at Aleppo, כַּסְסִי, evidently the same with כַּסְסִי *, is the *eagle-owl*; but it is still a question whether the Arabic and Persian translators rightly rendered the Heb. term.

Ib. *The sea-gull* †. Heb. שָׁלִיחַ—Sep. καταρακτης—Vulg. *mergulus*—Onk. Tharg. Syr. שָׁלִיחַ—Sam. ver. שָׁלִיחַ—Both Arabs, سَلْحَ—Perf. سَلْحَ—Gr. Ven. πτελας.—That this is a *plunging* bird, I have little doubt. Some modern critics think it is the *Pelecanus Bassinus* of Linnæus. The Chald. and Syr. version, שָׁלִיחַ, *fish-catcher*, favours this rendering; nor less the Greek καταρακτης, which, according to Aristotle, draws for its food fishes from the bottom of the sea ‡.

Ib. *The ibis*. Heb. נִשְׁפָּף—Sep. ἰβίς—Vulg. *ibis*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. נִשְׁפָּף—Sam. ver. נִשְׁפָּף—Both Arabs, نِشْفَ—Perf. نِشْفَ—Gr. Ven. νιψα.—That this is the *ibis* I think is highly probable, both on the authority of Sep. and even from the etymon of the Heb. word, which in Syr. signifies *mundus, purus*. Now it is a peculiar property in the *ibis* never to drink but *pure and clear* water: hence the Egyptian priests are said to have bathed themselves in such places as they had observed the *ibis* to drink in §. Our public version has here *the great owl*; Bate, the *twilight-bird*; Dathe, *noctua*; Michaëlis, *das käutzgen*.

Ver.

* It has even been surmised that this was originally the Heb. word. It is said that some mss. have כַּסְסִי instead of כַּסְסִי; but I find no such reading either in Kennicott or De Rossi. There is, indeed, no impossibility of כַּסְסִי having been, by an ignorant or careless transcriber, converted into כַּסְסִי, or even כַּסְסִי; yet it is not probable, as all the Sam. copies here agree with Heb.

† In my text there is a transposition here; the *ibis* is wrongly placed before the *sea-gull*.

‡ Our common version has *the cormorant*; Bate, *the plunger*; Dathe, *mergulus*; Michaëlis, "der

"läucher." § The *ibis* is thus described by Hasselquist: "It is of the size of a raven-ben, and is seen in great numbers, during the overflowing of the Nile, in those places which the water does not reach, and afterwards in the places which the water has deserted. It feeds on insects and small frogs, which abound in Egypt during the inundation of the Nile, and for some time after, being by this means of great service to the country. They often assem-

Ver. 18. *The swan* *. Heb. תנינא—Sep. πορφυριων—Vulg. *cygnus*—Onk. כנא—Tharg. אומא—Syr. כנבי—Sam. ver. קנפי—Both Arabs, שנו—Perf. ברסתר—Gr. Ven. εμοδιος.—It is extremely uncertain what bird this is. Hence Dathe and Michaëlis have retained the Heb. name, the *tinghemeth*.—Bochart's conjecture that it is the *owl*, *noctua*, is not at all probable. Bate thought it was the *cormorant*; and observes, that "this, and several other water-fowls, " are remarkable for blowing out a particular note or noise."—He alludes to the root נשם, which signifies to *breathe*, *respire*, &c. If etymology were here to be made a guide, I would rather say that it points to a well-known quality in the swan, that of being able to *respire* a long time with its bill and neck entirely under water, and even plunged in the mud.

1b. *The pelican*. Heb. תנא—Sep. πικαλας—Vulg. *onocrotalus*—Onk. קנא—Tharg. and Syr. קנא—Sam. ver. קנא—Saad. קנא—Erp. and Perf. קנא—Gr. Ven. *caret*.—This bird is generally, and with much probability, thought to be the *pelican*. Some have taken it for the *cuckoo*, led, perhaps, by the Arab. and Perfic name. From Heb. etymology we here derive no help; but the Arabic תנא, *aluit*, seems to point out the attention with which the pelican feeds and nurses its young.

1b. *The stork*. Heb. דומא—Sep. αωωος—Vulg. *porphyrio*—Onk. דקרא—Tharg. and Syr. שרקר—Sam. ver. נעסיה—Saad. דומא—Erp. דומא—Perf. בלבל, certainly the *nightingale*. Gr. Ven. *caret*.—From the well-known filial and parental affection of the *stork*, and from the name being here placed immediately after the pelican, I was led to believe that דומא ought to be rendered the *stork*; I am now convinced that my conjecture was ill-founded.—From Dr. Ruffel we learn, that at Aleppo the *vultur perenopterus* of Linnæus is called דומא, which is evidently the same name with the Heb. דומא, and the Arab. דומא. Yet it is not easy to conceive how such a bird as this could derive its name from דומא, which is certainly more proper to express the manners of the *stork* †.

Ver. 19. There is here an omission of one name in my version. Read then thus: "the heron and anaphas of every kind."—And now, first, of

The heron. Heb. דודא—Sep. εωωος ‡—Vulg. *herodio*—Onk. דודא—Tharg. דודא—Syr. דודא—Sam. ver. דודא—Saad. דודא—Erp. דודא—Perf. סוד.—From the radical meaning of the Heb. word דודא, this has also been supposed to denote the *stork*, "a *serpēs naturalis*, et *charitatis affectu erga parentes*."—The Oriental translators seem to have taken it for a species of *kite*, or *falcon*. Perhaps the Arab. דודא is the French *fauc*, *fulco facer*. But where every thing is so uncertain, it is better to hold by the Septuagint, and the other Greek interpreters, followed by Vulg.

"ble, particularly mornings and evenings, in the gardens, in such numbers as to cover the palm-trees. When this bird "rests it sits upright, so as to cover its feet with its tail, and raises the breast and neck." From this upright posture of the *ibis*, a staunch etymologist would draw another argument; for קב, or קפ, in Arab. signifies *erect*; and אומא is the Chald. and Syr. rendering of קפ. But much stress is not to be laid on such round-about etyma.

* There is here again a mistake in the text of my version; *pelican* is before *swan*, whereas it should follow it. † The

vultur perenopterus is thus described by Hasselquist, p. 194: "The appearance of this bird is as horrid as can well be imagined. The face is naked and wrinkled; the eyes are large and black; the beak black and crooked, the talons large, and extended ready for prey; and the whole body polluted with filth: qualities enough to make the beholders shudder with horror."—No wonder that such an animal should be deemed unclean.

‡ So also *Aquila*, *Theo-*

dotion, and the Greek of Venice.

Ib: *Anapbas of every kind*. I have not rendered the word אֲנַפָּה, because I have no conception of its meaning, any more than of the word *χαλαδριος* *, by which it is rendered in Sep. and Vulg. Were we to lean upon etymology, we should call it some *angry, furious* bird; and so it is rendered by Montanus, *avis furibunda*. The other versions are: Onk. אֲנָבִי—Tharg. אֲנַפָּה—Syr. אֲנַפָּה, the Heb. word—Sam. ver. אֲנַפָּה—Saad. אֲנַפָּה—Erp. אֲנַפָּה—Perf. אֲנַפָּה—Gr. Ven. *Supercus* †—In our com. ver. it is *the heron*, but, in our more ant. translations, *the jay*.—Some think it is the *plover*.—In short, all is mere conjecture.

Ib: *The boopop*. Heb. דּוּכִיפָּה ‡—Sep. *dukipa*—Vulg. *upupa*—Onk. and Tharg. דּוּכִיפָּה, *the mountain-cock*—Syr. דּוּכִיפָּה; of the same import, according to some lexicographers; but the *boopop*, according to Bahr-balul, in Castell.—Sam. ver. דּוּכִיפָּה—Both Arabs, דּוּכִיפָּה—Perf. דּוּכִיפָּה—Gr. Ven. *αγρια λεκτορις*.—It is, most probably, the *boopop*, or *lapwing*, which Pliny calls an obscene bird §.

Ib: *The bat*. Heb. עֵטָלָה—Sep. *etpala*—Vulg. *vespertilio*—Onk. עֵטָלָה; the Heb. word Chaldaized—Syr. עֵטָלָה, *bat*—Tharg. עֵטָלָה—Sam. ver. עֵטָלָה—Both Arabs, עֵטָלָה—Perf. עֵטָלָה—Gr. Ven. *etpala*.—So that, on the whole, we may almost certainly conclude this to be *the bat*.

Here, then, are twenty different birds, forbidden to be eaten by the Mosaic law; and no doubt, at that time, they were all well known by distinguishing characters: some, perhaps, were peculiar to Egypt and Arabia; but unless some intelligent person and good grammarian residing for a considerable time in those regions, and learning from the inhabitants the various vulgar names of every indigenous bird, take the trouble to make a comparative nomenclature of them, we shall never arrive at any thing like certainty with respect to their real names. For the sake of those who wish to explore this matter, as far as a general knowledge gathered from Lexicons, or other Oriental compositions, can enable one, I have been at some pains to exhibit, in no enormous space, the renderings of the antient versions; by comparing which with one another, and with the original, some considerable light may yet be thrown on the subject by the united efforts of philologists; who should communicate, one to another, what particular remarks they may have made.

Ver. 20. *Every flying creature which crawleth on four feet, &c.* This is a general precept, including every winged animal which hath more than two feet, except those mentioned in the next two verses.

Ver. 22. *The arba*. Heb. אֲרִבָּה—Sep. *aribus*—Vulg. *bruchus*—Onk. and Tharg. and Sam. ver. אֲרִבָּה—Syr. אֲרִבָּה—Both Arabs, אֲרִבָּה—Gr. Ven. *arbus*—Our com. ver. “the locust.”—It is supposed, with no small probability, to be the *gryllus gregarius* of Forskal, or the common gregarious *locust*, which the Arabs call אֲרִבָּה, *djerad*; and which the Jews who dwell in Yemen assured Forskal is the same with the Heb. אֲרִבָּה.

Ib: *The solam*. Heb. and Perf. סִלְעָם—Sep. *solamus*—Vulg. *attacus*—Onk. Tharg. and Sam. ver. סִלְעָם—Syr. *caret*—Saad. סִלְעָם—Erp. סִלְעָם—Gr. Ven. *solamus*—Our English ver-

* It is supposed to be the *Egyptian dotterell*. † He seems to have had a wish to express the literal meaning of the Heb. and invented a term for the purpose, of the same meaning with *Supercus*, *animated, angry*.

‡ So Heb.; but Sam. has דּוּכִיפָּה, § Sam. has דּוּכִיפָּה, דּוּכִיפָּה, דּוּכִיפָּה, and דּוּכִיפָּה. One Heb. ms. has דּוּכִיפָּה. § “*Upupa obscena passu avia*.” Plin. 10. 36.

sion, "the ~~hald~~ locust."—Bate, *the rock-bred locust*.—It is supposed to be the *gryllus everfor*.

Ib. *The bargol*. Heb. Syr. both Arabs, and Perf. חרגל—Sep. *ophiomachus*—Vulg. *ophiomachus*—Onk. חרגל—Tharg. חרגל—Sam. ver. חרגל—Gr. Ven. *attilades*—In our common ver. "the beetle."—Bate: the *adder-spear*.—It is supposed to be the *gryllus verrucosus* of Linnæus.

Ib. *The bagab*. Heb. and Perf. חבב—Onk. חבב—Tharg. חבב—Syr. *caret*—Sam. ver. חבב—Gr. Ven. *caret*—Our com. ver. "the grasshopper"—Bate, *the bagab*.—It is supposed to be the *gryllus coronatus* of Linnæus*.

Michælis was of opinion that the four names above were only one insect, at different periods of its existence, and in his German version thus renders the colon: "Die heuschrecken nach der ersten, zweiten, dritten, und vierten häutung †"—But this, in my opinion, is highly improbable, and repugnant to the text, which adds לטעו after every one of the four insects: This alone destroys Michælis's conjecture.—We now come to

UNCLEAN REPTILES ‡.

Ver. 29. *The mole*. Heb. and Saad. חולד—Sep. *galea*—Vulg. *mustela*—Onk. חולד—Tharg. חולד—Syr. כפושח; the same word, but differently spelled—Arab. Exp. חולד; it changed into כ—Sam. ver. חולד; the Heb. word Samaritanized—Perf. חולד—Gr. Ven. *mygale*.—I have no doubt of its being *the mole*; for which, at this day, חולד is the name at Aleppo. See Ruffel.

Ib. *The mouse*. Heb. עכבר—Sep. *mus*—Vulg. *mus*—Onk. and Tharg. עכבר—Syr. עכבר—Sam. ver. עכבר—Both Arabs, פטר—Perf. פטר—Gr. Ven. *mus*.—There is no doubt of this being *the mouse*.

Ib. *The land-crocodile*. Heb. and both Arabs, צב—Sep. *procodilus* & *cherosmos*—Vulg. *crocodilus*—Onk. צב—Tharg. צב—Syr. חרדנ—Sam. ver. חרדנ—Perf. חרדנ—Gr. Ven. *ailauros*.—When I wrote my version, I had little doubt of this being the *land-crocodile*, the *σαῖγκας* of Dioscorides, and the *scincus* of Pliny; but on comparing Forkal with Hasselquist, I am inclined to think that the animal here forbidden is the *lacerta cordylus* of Linnæus ‖.

Ver. 30. *The newt*. Heb. and Tharg. חנק—Sep. *mygale*—Vulg. *mygale*—Onk. חנק—Syr. חנק—Sam. ver. חנק—Saad. חנק—Exp. חנק—Perf. חנק—Gr. Ven. *chamaeleon*.—This is supposed to be the *lizard of the Nile* ¶.

Ib. *The green lizard*. Heb. כח—Sep. *chamaeleon*—Vulg. *chamaeleon*—Onk. כח—Tharg. כח—Syr. חולד—Sam. ver. כח—Both Arabs, חרדנ—Perf. חרדנ—Gr. Ven. *σαῖγκας*.—The name of this animal seems to be derived from its *strength*. In fact, the *green lizard* is

* See Tychsen's Comment. *De locustis Biblicis*, printed at Rostock in 1787.

† The locust, in its first, second,

third, and fourth state.

‡ In Hebrew the word *reptile* is more extensive than in modern languages.

§ Misprinted in Pol. ברבשח.

|| By Hasselquist described thus: "Cauda verticillata, squamis denticulatis,

"pedibus penta-dactylis."—By Forkal thus: "Femora teretia, sine verrucis, cauda verticillata non longa; squamæ

"pauciores, subconicæ, mucronatæ: corpus nudum rugosum."

¶ "Lacerta nilotica, cauda tereti longa,

"corpore toto glabro, squamis angulo obtuso notatis." Hasselquist, p. 225. It is met with in the moist places of Egypt, near the Nile.

three times bigger than the common grey lizard. It appears to be the *lacerta bellio* of Linnæus*.

Ib. *The red lizard.* Heb. לִטְוֶה—Sep. χαλαζωτης—Vulg. *bellio*—Onk. חִלְשֹׁה—Tharg. חִלְשֹׁה—Syr. צִרְחִיָּה—Sam. ver. לִטְוֶה—Both Arabs, لُطْوَى—Perf. لُ—Gr. Ven. σκαλοπεν-
δα.—Bochart has made it very probable that this is a species of red lizard, called by the Arabs *wachra*, וַחְרָה †. Some take it to be the *salamander*; to which perhaps it has some resemblance in shape and size, although not in colour.

Ib. *The snail.* Heb. שָׁחַל—Sep. σαμα—Vulg. *lacerta*—Onk. חִלְשֹׁה—Tharg. חִלְשֹׁה—Syr. חִלְשֹׁה—Sam. ver. קִרְדָּה—Both Arabs, حِرْبَا—Perf. حِرْبَا—Gr. Ven. φερραιος.—Bochart labours to prove that this is another species of lizard, called by the Arabs *chulaca*, חִלְכָּה, which is said to live in the sand; but his arguments are more specious than solid. Etymology is evidently against him, but favours the *snail*. In Chald. חֲסַח signifies *incurvation, in se reflectere*.—The principal Jewish rabbies, and the mass of modern interpreters, have *snail*.

Ib. *The chameleon.* Heb. תַּנְשֵׁמֶת—Sep. ασπαλαξ—Vulg. *talpa*—Onk. חִלְשֹׁה—Tharg. חִלְשֹׁה—Syr. חִלְשֹׁה—Sam. ver. חִלְשֹׁה—Saad. חִלְשֹׁה—Exp. חִלְשֹׁה—Perf. חִלְשֹׁה—Gr. Ven. ασπαλαγξ.—I am inclined to think, with Bochart, that this is the *chameleon*. Here etymology is particularly favourable: *respiration* is so applicable to the chameleon, that it is said to live on air †. However, some modern critics think that תַּנְשֵׁמֶת is not the *chameleon*, but the *lacerta geck*, mentioned in the note to the last article but one. See Rosenmüller in loc.

CHAP. XII.

THE regulations contained in the first five verses of this chap. seem to be founded on some national prejudice, and not on any real difference in the condition of the mother; yet the prejudice was not peculiar to the Jews, or rather Egyptians, from whom I doubt not Moses took the idea. Hippocrates, the father of Greek physic, thus expresses himself: Ἡ καθαρισις γινεται τῆσι γυναιξί μετα του τοκου, ὡς ἐπὶ το πολὺ ἐπὶ μὲν τῇ κοῦρῃ ἡμερησί τεσσαράκοντα καὶ δύο . . . ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ κοῦρῳ ἡ καθαρισις γινεται ἡμερησί τριακοντα.—The two periods, indeed, differ greatly; Hippocrates gives only 42 days after the birth of a girl, and 30 after the birth of a boy; Moses allots to the former 80 days, to the latter 40. From the best inquiries, there is in this country no

* The Arabs call it *bardun*, بَرْدُون; which is the term used by both Arabs here. † It is thus described by the Arab writers: "Animalculum rubrum terræ adherens, ut lacerta—quæcumque cibum aut potum calcat veneno suo inficiens."—One would think that this is the same with the *lacerta gecko* of Linnæus, of which Hasselquist: "The poison of this animal is very singular, as it exhales from the lobuli of the toes. At Cairo I had once an opportunity of observing how acrid the exhalations of the toes of this animal are. As it ran over the hand of a man, who was endeavouring to catch it, there immediately rose little red pustules over all those parts which the animal had touched." p. 220.

‡ That it lives altogether on air, is not probable; yet it certainly lives a considerable time without any visible food.—"I kept one alive," says Hasselquist, p. 219, "for 24 days, from the 8th of March to the 1st of April, without affording it an opportunity of taking any food; yet it was nimble and lively during the whole time, climbing up and down in its cage, fond of being near the light, and constantly rolling its eyes. I could however, at last, plainly perceive that it waxed lean, and suffered from hunger."

foundation for any distinction : what may happen in other climates, it is impossible to say ; but I believe it is all a superstitious prepossession, founded on the supposed deterioration of the sex.

C H A P. XIII.

FOR the nature of the *leprosy*, concerning which this chapter lays down very particular laws, I must refer my readers to those who have purposely treated on the subject, more especially to Hillary's *Observations on the Diseases of Barbadoes*, Schilling *De Lepra*, and Dr. Rossel's *History of Aleppo*. I shall content myself with making some philological remarks on certain words and passages.

Ver. 2. *A pustule, scurf, or spot*. The Heb. words are פֹּחַח—סֹפֶחַ—בֹּרֵחַ.—Sep. according to the common reading, have only σκλη σηματος τηλαυγης ; but I am persuaded that the true reading is σηματος, which is that of Alex. and that αργαματος has been dropped out of the text. It was read by Hesychius, and is the marginal reading of Leipf.—In ch. 14. 56. the same Heb. words are in Sep. rendered σκλης, και σηματος, και του αργαζοντος ; or, as Compl. and Oxon. αργαματος.

Ver. 4. *The priest shall shut up the infected person, &c.* I have followed the common idea, which supposes that נָגַע is metonymically for the infected person : *plaga pro homine plagâ lepræ affecto*. But in the late Bishop Law's ms. Notes I find another version, which is very plausible : "The priest shall bind up the sore ;" and so, throughout, he renders דָּבַח דָּבַח וְנָגַע.

Ver. 10. *And that there is also raw flesh in the pustule*. וְנִמְצָא בָּשָׂר חַיָּה בַּפֹּחַח. Lit. *et vivacitas carnis viva in tumore*. The version of Sep. appears strange at first sight, and has by some critics been deemed unintelligible. But I think it easy to reconcile it to sense, and to the original. They considered the ח in נִמְצָא as a prefix, and gave to the word ὕγις a meaning equivalent to ζῶν, as they do twice again in ver. 15. where χῶς ὕγις is the same with *caro viva*. I think, however, that the editions of Sep. are here wrongly pointed, and that ver. 10 and 11 should be connected thus : Καὶ, ἀπο τοῦ ὕγιος τῆς σαρκὸς ζώσης ἐν τῇ σκλη, λεπροὶ πολλαπλασιάζονται ἐξ αὐτῆς.

There is a seeming, and indeed but a seeming, redundancy in the text, which induced Nannings and Rosenmüller to search for a new meaning for the word נִמְצָא. The former, in a Dissertation first printed at Grönigen in 1759, and reprinted in Schultens's *Sylloge* 1775, pars ii. p. 901—906, labours to prove that נִמְצָא here means "cicatrix seu locus ubi caro cutis se in unum contrahit," from the Arab. حَزَب, *contrahere* ; and thus he renders the verse : "Et viderit sacerdos, et ecce tumor albus in cute, hæc quæ mutavit pilum album, et cicatrix, (vel si malis) *contractio* carnis vivæ sit in illo tumore."—"Thus all is plain," adds he ; but not so says Rosenmüller : "for, besides that this interpretation appears to be far-fetched (far-fetched indeed !) and unknown to all the ant. translators, it is moreover inadmissible, because cause tumors in leprosy produce no such *cicatrices*." Therefore Rosenmüller seeks another meaning, and finds it in the Chald. נִמְצָא and the Syr. נִמְצָא, which signify *indicare*. "Hence," says he, "נִמְצָא, put here for נִמְצָא, will be an *index, mark, sign* ; and the true rendering of "וְנִמְצָא בָּשָׂר חַיָּה will be *signum carnis crudæ*."—Onkelos, Tharg. and the Syr. version, are certainly

certainly favourable to this interpretation, the two former having **וְשֵׁן**, and the latter **וְשֵׁמָה**; to whom ought to be added Arab. Erp. who has **عِلْمَان**; and this rendering is not implausible: yet I cannot think it the true one. I believe that **כֹּחַ** is here, not a *redundative*, but an *augmentative*, and well expresses the uncommon *redness* of the *raw*, or *living* flesh, which appears in this sort of leprosy, commonly called the *yaws*. See Hillary, in the work above mentioned.—Dathe renders, not improperly, thus: *Atque in eo priuserea massa carnis rubra existit*.—Michaëlis: “Und in dem geschwulst ein rothes fleisch.”—So Hezel’s improvement of Lather: “Und rohe fleisch im geschwür ist.”—Our Bate has also well expressed the meaning: “And quick flesh be growing up in the rising:” with this note: “or a growth of proud flesh, which is quick and sore.”—I had almost forgotten to remark, that Gr. Ven. has well and literally rendered his original by **Και ζωων σαρκος ζωης εν τη αμμοτι**.

Ver. 12. *But if the leprosy have so spread itself.* **וְאִם פָּרַח פָּרַח הַצָּרַעַת**. Lit. *Si florendo floruerit*—Sep. **ואם פרח פרח הצרעת** *—Vulg. *sin autem effloruerit discurrens lepra*: than which a better Latin version can hardly be made, as it admirably well expresses the last period of the *yaws*. See Hillary.

Ver. 23. *If the spot remain as it was.* **אִם תִּשְׁתָּהּ כְּעוֹד תְּבוֹהַת**. Lit. *Si sub se steterit splendor*: an Hebraism equivalent to *loco suo*, as all the antients render it, except Gr. Ven. who, according to his usual method, gives us literal Greek for literal Hebrew: **Ἦν δὲ ἐφ’ ἑαυτῇ στη το λαμπρυναι τουτο**.

Ib. *It is but the scar of the boil.* **צֶרֶת הַשֹּׁחַן הַזֶּה**. Sep. **אולה του ελκους εστι**. Vulg. *ulceris est cicatrix*. And so equivalently all the antients, except Gr. Ven. who has **καυσις του ελκους εστι**. Our common English version has: “It is a burning boil:” an unwarrantable translation. Much better their predeceffors, Coverdale and Matthew: “It is the print of the boil:” and Cranmer: “It is the scar of a boil.”—I wonder that Dathe should follow the other rendering: *Ulcus est inflammatum*.—Michaëlis: “So ist es weiter nichts als ein vom geschwür übrig gebliebenes mahl.” In like manner Hezel, Rosenmüller, and other moderns. **צֶרֶת** is to be understood in the same sense here as in ver. 28.

Ver. 30. *Yellowish hairs.* **עַד צֶהַב צָהָב**.—Sep. **θμξ ξανθουσα λεπη** †—Vulg. *capillus flavus, folioque subtilior*—And so equivalently all the other versions. I have not rendered the word **עד**, because I believe that it relates not to the minuteness of the hairs, but to their colour, which was not quite *yellow*, but inclining to it, *yellowish*. Others may think otherwise. Our common version is, “a yellow thin hair;” followed by Bate and Purver.

Ib. *It is a leprous scall.* **נֶחֱקַח הַזֶּה**. The word **נֶחֱקַח** is variously rendered. Sep. **θραυσμα**—Vulg. *caret*—Onk. **נֶחֱקַח**—Tharg. **נֶחֱקַח**—Sam. ver. and Erp. **נֶחֱקַח**—Saad. **كحل**—Perf. **נֶחֱקַח**—Gr. Ven. **σπασμα**.—I find no better English term to express the meaning of the original than that of our common version, *scall*, or *dandruff*.—Dathe, *porrigo*.—Michaëlis turns the colon thus: “So ist es ein kopf-aussatz oder bart-aussatz.”

Ver. 39. *It is but a morpew.* **נֶחֱקַח הַזֶּה**.—Sep. and Gr. Ven. **αλφος εστι**—Vulg. *macula coloris candidi*—Onk. **נֶחֱקַח**—Syr. **نقعة**, *impetigo*; not *elephantiasis*, as in Polyglott. Michaëlis† has clearly shown that this cutaneous disorder is neither dangerous nor contagious. For the rest, we

* Gr. Ven. **Ἦν δὲ ἐφ’ ἑαυτῇ στησις ἡ λεπρα**.

† Gr. Ven. **Θμξ ξανθῇ λεπη**.

‡ *Mof. Rechi*. part iv. scd. 210. Iearn

learn from both Forſkal and Niebuhr that the ſame diſeaſe is ſtill called בֹּדַק by the Arabs of the preſent day.

Ver. 42. *A white and red ſore.* נָנַע לֶבָן וְאֶדְמִים—Sep. αψη λευκη η πυρριζουσα—Vulg. *albus vel rufus color.* Hence ſome critics * think they muſt have read in their texts לֶבָן וְאֶדְמִים, and deem this reading preferable to that of the preſent text. The Syr. tranſlator has alſo the diſjunctive particle וְ; but all the other verſions read as the Heb. nor is there any variety of leſion in either the Heb. or Sam. mss.; I cannot therefore but prefer it to that of Sep. The appearance here mentioned had a mixture of white and red in it, λευκη κασταυρος, as Gr. Ven. well renders. It is here oppoſed to the *obſcure white* mentioned in ver. 39.

Ver. 43. *A bandage about his chin.* וְעַל שֵׁם יָעָטָה. Sep. και περι το στομαχ αυτου περιβαλεσθω—Vulg. *os velle contectum*; and ſo equivalently moſt of the ant. verſions. But if the bandage had been put about his mouth, how could he cry out “Unclean! unclean!” as he is ordered to do in the ſame verſe? The Thargumiſt, Pſeudo-Jonathan, ſeems to have been aware of this, and obviates the objection by giving a different nominative to יָעָטָה. For thus he renders וְכִרְחַם סָבְרוּ וְאָמַר, *and a crier ſhall proclaim and ſay*, &c.—The word שֵׁם occurs but five times in the Bible, nor is any help towards diſcovering its radical meaning to be derived from the other dialects. In 2 Sam. 19. 24. it is commonly rendered *beard*. In Ezek. 24. 17 and 22. and in Mic. 3. 7. it is, in our public verſion, rendered *lips*, and here *upper lip*; but it cannot, I think, mean either the *lips* or the *upper lip*, properly ſo called. It may poſſibly denote the *hair* about the *lips*, and ſo Saadiah underſtood it. Gr. Ven. too, has καπι του μυστακος ελκεται: which coincides with our common verſion. I am apt to think, however, that it was not the *upper lip*, nor the *muſtachios* on it, that was covered, but the whole *chin* and *beard*; ſo that the mouth had juſt freedom to make the declaration “Unclean! unclean!” which, thus tied up, it muſt have done in a moſt doleful and alarming accent.

Ver. 47. Of the nature of the *leproſy* infecting garments, it is hard even to form a plausible conjecture. When Michaëlis was conſidering the ſubject, he was told by a wool-merchant, that the wool of ſheep who die of diſeaſe, and which has not been ſhorn from the live animal, was unfit for manufacturing cloth, and liable to ſomething like what Moſes here deſcribes. I doubt very much of the fact, and would invite our cloth-manufacturers to examine the matter with accuracy, and deliver their candid opinions.

Ver. 48. *In the warp or in the woof.* בִּשְׂתֵי אוֹ בְעֵרָב. Sep. Η εν ζημονι, η εν προκη†—Vulg. *In ſtamine atque (aut) ſubtegmine*; and ſo the other verſions. Yet ſome moderns have objected to this verſion, as totally inadmiſſible: their reaſon is, that it is incompatible with ver. 52 and 56. “Quomodo enim,” ſays Dathe, “comburī poteſt ſecundum ver. 52, *five flamen, five ſubtegmen vitioſæ veſtis? aut quomodo ex veſte, leprâ infecta, pars vitioſa, ſecundum ver. 56, vel ex ſtamine, vel ex ſubtegmine ſcindi poteſt, cum tota veſtis, ſeu pannus, ſtamine ac ſubtegmine unicè conſlet?*”—I can readily answer theſe queries, which are founded on a falſe ſuppoſition. In ver. 52 it is not *either* the warp *or* the woof that is to be burned, but the whole garment in which a leproſy is found, either in the warp

* Michaëlis, Dathe, Roſcumüller, &c.—All our Engliſh verſions, down to Bate and Purver, have *a white reddiſh ſore*.

† The very ſame words are employed by Gr. Ven.

or in the woof; and that, in ver. 56, it is not either the warp or the woof that is to be torn out of the cloth, but the whole piece of cloth in which, whether in woof or warp, the infection is contained. This, to me, is so clear from the whole context, that I cannot but wonder how such critics as Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, and Rosenmüller, should find any difficulty in the passage, and have recourse to such forced and far-fetched explanations.—Le Clerc imagined that by *warp* and *woof* were meant the threads of yarn before they were wove into cloth; an absurd idea, as Dathe himself allows: but not much less ridiculous is that of Houbigant, which he however adopts: “Unus, quod ego quidem sciam, Houbigantius, eam (difficultatem) removere tentavit. Primo, negat שרר et ערב *flamen*, et sub-
“*tegmen* significare posse. Leguntur hæc vocabula tantum in hac pericopa, in qua illam
“significationem, pro contextu, prorsus non habere possunt. Igitur de alia est cogitandum,
“quam contextus admittit. Jam vero constat ערב significare vestem texturæ diversæ, hoc est,
“quæ constat filis spissioribus et tenuioribus, uti est in tapetibus et aliis vestibus ex lana et
“lino paratis. Sub שרר vero intelligit *texturam simplicem* quæ constat filis ejusdem formæ,
“sive generis. Ex origine admittunt hanc significationem: nam שרר ex Syr. שרר texere
“illustrandum esse jam in Lexicis observatum est: ערב autem *miscendi* notionem habere
“dubio caret: et quoniam tantum in hac pericopa occurrunt, nemo neget ea, ut vocabula
“artis, hanc significationem habere posse. Non sum nescius ex contextu significationem
“voci divinari non tuto posse, qui sæpe quam plures admittat; neque contradicam, si quis
“alias magis aptas significationes illis vocibus substituat, dummodo mihi concedatur *hactenus*
“*allatas per contextum nullo modo eis tribui posse.*”

I have laid before my learned readers Dathe's own words, without abridgment, that I might not seem to weaken his argument; and now I only request them to read over the text carefully, and then say if they see any necessity for abandoning the antient versions, and for seeking a new meaning to the words שרר and ערב. Indeed, no two words are more fit to express the *warp* and *woof* of a web. The former consists of double rows, שרר, of threads, between which the latter passes, and by passing makes that *mixture* denoted by the word ערב. There is no need of having recourse to the Syr. שרר to explain the Heb. שרר: on the contrary, I believe the former, in the sense of *weaving*, is a denominative verb from the latter. At any rate, it has nothing to do here; nor is שרר to be derived from שרר, *to drink*; it is neither more nor less than the sem. plur. of שרר, *two*; and a most fit term, as I have already observed, to denote the *warp* of a web.

C H A P. XIV.

Ver. 4. *TWO small birds.* שרר צפורים. Vulg. *duos passeret*, “two sparrows;” and so some other versions; but better Sep. *duo opuscula*—Gr. Ven. *duo opuscula*. The word *sparrow* is here too definite; any small bird that was not unclean might be offered.

1b. *Cedar-wood.* עץ ארז. Celsus will have it to be the *pine*; but there is no doubt of its being the *cedar*, which by the inhabitants of Lebanon is still called by the same Heb. name.—For the rest, it appears from Dioscorides and other antient writers that cedar-wood
and

and hyssop were used together as medicinal, and particularly in cutaneous disorders. See Le Clerc in loc.

Ver. 10. *A log of oil.* The *log* is supposed to have contained six eggs: i. e. as much as the contents of six eggs.

Ver. 34. See my Explanatory Note. I will only add, that this sort of house-leprosy is called by the Germans *salpeter frass*, as it is supposed principally to arise from *salpêtre*.—In these western regions it is seldom very noxious, and for the most part only in the lower floors. See Michaëlis's *Mosaïches Recht*, part iv. sect. 11. p. 269, of the 2d edit.

Ver. 36. The last part of this verse, *וְלֹא יִסָּמָךְ כָּל אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית*, has, I think, been universally misunderstood. Our common English version is, “that all that is in the house be not made unclean;” corresponding with Vulg. *ne immunda fiant omnia quæ in domo sunt*; and with Sep. *וְלֹא יִסָּמָךְ כָּל אֲשֶׁר בְּבֵית*. But this cannot, in my apprehension, be the meaning; for, how should the priest's going into the house make any thing in it unclean? The meaning is, that although the walls of the house might be infected, yet its contents were not for that defiled. These were therefore ordered to be brought out previously to the priest's going in, that the empty walls might be more accurately examined, and a judgment formed accordingly.

Ver. 37. *Exsudations.* *שִׁקְצוֹתָיו*. Sep. *καλιδάδες*—Vulg. *quasi valliculas*—Onk. *וְשִׁקְצוֹתָיו*, of a similar signification: and so our common version, “hollow streaks:” but in all such appearance that I have seen, the *streaks* were not hollow, but rather *convex*; and appeared to be *exsudations* from the wall, and for the most part of the colours here described. It is not easy to analyse the Heb. word. See Castell on the root *שִׁקַּץ*. I think the Syr. translator has well rendered it by *קלפא*; nor badly Saad. *דַּמְשִׁק*, *streaks*.

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 2. *A GONORRHEA.* I am told that some would-be critics have made themselves merry with this translation of the Heb. *זֶרַח מִבְּשָׁרוֹ*. One would imagine, say they, that the translator were rather a M. D. than a D. D. to make use of such a term in a version of the Bible. I should be glad to know what other English word expresses the meaning of the original; not surely that of our common version; “a running issue out of his flesh,” although seven words be used to express two! The marginal reading, “running of the reins,” is more definite; but if I had been the first who had risked it, I suspect it would have provoked a deeper sneer than *gonorrhœa*. The *fluxus seminis* of Vulg. is a most proper translation; and I might have rendered a *seed-flux*, as, in German, Michaëlis and Hezel, “saamenfluß.” Whether that or *gonorrhœa* be the more decent term, I leave to the reader of candour and taste to say.

Ver. 7. *Whosoever toucheth his flesh.* I have in Explan. Note said, that it is uncertain whether the word *flesh* here means the whole body, or only the part affected. Some think it denotes only the latter; and Dathe thus renders the comma, *qui verenda ejus teti-*

gerit*, adopted by Rosenmüller, who adds: "Id quod sine dubio est intelligendum de medico vel chirurgo: hinc potest colligi, agi hoc loco de gonorrhœa virulenta."—I still doubt.

Ver. 16. *A seminal emission.* שִׁכְבַּת זָרַע; rendered in our common version, "seed of copulation;" and so seemingly † Sep. *σπέρματος*; and more clearly Vulg. *semen coitus*.—The phrase was well understood by Syr. Saad. and Perf. who have all properly, though somewhat variously, rendered its true meaning. It evidently denotes *involuntary pollution*, particularly *nocturnal*; and not "the seed of copulation," to which ver. 18 refers.

Ver. 19. *She shall sequester herself seven days.* "On the coast of Oriza, in India, women in this situation are obliged to live separated from society four or five days, as impure and defiled. Whatever they touch in this state is equally deemed unclean; and they are under a legal obligation of purifying themselves by bathing, and certain beverages." Sonnerat, vol. i. p. 31.—What were the ideas of the antient Romans concerning this sort of impurity, it may be seen in Pliny, vii. 15. where he gives a horrid picture indeed of *menstruation* ‡:

Ver. 24. *Lying by her.* שָׁכַב אִתָּהּ; rendered in our common version, "lying with her;" and this, perhaps, was then no improper version, as *with* might have the same meaning as *by*: but as, by this latter word, the ambiguity is removed, I preferred it in my version. See Explan. Note.—Dathe, very properly, *juxta eam*; and, long before, honest Luther, "Und wenn ein mann bey ihr lieget." Michaëlis: "Läge jemand mit ihr in eben demselben bette."—It was lying *in the same bed with*, and not *lying with*, the menstruous woman, that is here forbidden. See ch. 20. 18. where he who *lay with* a woman in that situation is to be *cut off* from among his people.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 2. *IN the cloud.* Most of interpreters understand this of the cloud which guided the Israelites out of Egypt, and had hitherto hovered over the tabernacle, but now took its position over the ark, on which it rested ever after as a symbol of the divine presence, which the Jews call their *shechinah*. But this is all assertion, without the shadow of proof. The cloud here mentioned is evidently the cloud of smoke, as explained in ver. 13.—I subjoin the excellent note of Rosenmüller: "Totius igitur versus sensus est hic: Non veniat Aaron ad me sic leviter: non ita temerè coram me compareat; moriretur, enim, si hoc auderet: verum conspiciat in nube, (seu per nubem) scilicet *fumi ex suffitu*, quæ tegat propitiatorium, totamque adeo arcam. Qui adytum ingrediendi modus ver. 12, 13. plenius describitur, ubi disertè dicitur *nubem suffitus tegere debere operculum, quod super arca Legum est*."

* So likewise Michaëlis: "Wer die schamtheile des kranke berührt." † I say seemingly; for *σπέρμα* is not probably here for coitus, but for *cubile*, or *cubatio*. ‡ "Nihil faciliè reperiatur mulierum profluvio magis monstrificum. Accedunt superventu multa—sterilescunt iactæ fruges, moriuntur insita, exuruntur hortorum germina; & fructus arborum, quibus insedere, decidunt. Speculorum fulgor adspectu ipso hebetatur—acies ferri perstringitur, eborisque nitor—alvei apium emoriantur—æ etiam ac ferrum rubigo protinus corripit—in rabiem aguntur gustato canes, atque insanabili veneno morsus inficitur, &c. &c."—This is surely *bigb*, but as certainly *false*, colouring.

“ Si autem jam fuisset nubes in Propitiatorio, quæ divinæ majestatis præsentiam occultaret, cur Deus jussisset aliam excitare ex suffitu, quæ hanc ipsam nubem ita occultaret, ut nec a pontifice posset conspici.”

Vcr. 8. *The scape-goat.* The Heb. word is *אֲזַיִז*; the meaning of which has, without much reason, I think, been much contested. It appears to be a compound of *זָי* and *אֲזַיִז*, which last, in Arab. signifies *removed, separated, receded*; and the Sept. have well rendered by *ἀποπομπαιος*—Vulg. *emmissarius*.

Vcr. 21. *By a person appointed.* *בִּיד אִישׁ עֵרִי*. Sep. *ἐν χειρὶ ἀνθρώπου σταυμοῦ*—Vulg. *per hominem paratum*. It has been thought that they read in their text *עֵרִי*; but as there is no vestige of such a reading in any Heb. or Sam. copy, I think it is more probable that they gave to *עֵרִי* a meaning not indeed so appropriate as might have been given, but still suitable to the place. *עֵרִי* signifies *a man chosen for the occasion, vir opportunus*; or, as Gr. Vcn. has very properly rendered, *ἀνὴρ ὁρίσας*.

C H A P. XVII.

Ver. 3. IT is diverting to observe how the sticklers for the integrity of the present Hebrew text strain themselves to defend the reading in this verse, and reconcile it with Deut. 12. 15. To tell us that Moses here forbids the private slaughtering and eating of clean animals, on account of the propensity of the Israelites to idolatry, and yet repeals this very interdiction when he comes to the confines of Chanaan, is surely to amuse us with the most futile of all arguments; as if the Israelites were less in danger of being led into idolatry at the latter period than at the former. But what need of all this, when the Sam. text has preserved the very words that are here wanting to make Moses consistent with himself?—If it be urged, that the addition in the Sam. text is an interpolation from Deut. I would ask, how this same interpolation came into the Greek version of Sep. made by Jews, and used in their Egyptian synagogues?—“They translated,” it has been answered, “from a Sam. copy.”—Did they? Then, to me, nothing can be a stronger presumption in favour of the Sam. copy, as they must have considered it as a pure and genuine text at the time when they made their translation. Indeed, without their admirable translation, and the Sam. copy of the original, we should have but a lame copy of the Pentateuch; as I hope to be able to evince in another place.

Ver. 7. *To demons, after which they banker.* *לְשֵׁעִירִים אֲשֶׁר חַם זֵים אַחֲרֵיהֶם*; in our common version rendered, “unto devils, after whom they have gone a-whoring.” Sep. and Vulg. have likewise *εἰς πορνείαν*, and *fornicati sunt*; but the other versions* mollify the word *זֵים* into *going astray, following, banking after*, which I have imitated in my translation. For the rest, perhaps *goats* would be preferable to *demons*; and so Bate in his version, and both Secker and Law in their ms. notes. Others render *satyrs*: so Dathe, *satyris*—Michaëlis, “waldteufeln.”—The prohibition evidently alludes to the worship of Pan, under the form

* Except Gr. Vcn. which here agrees with Sep.

of a goat, or other wild hairy animal, such as the fauns and satyrs were represented to be. The Egyptians of Mendes were, in particular, noted for this sort of idolatry, which was highly obscene and lascivious. See Bochart. *Hieroz.* p. 1. l. 11. c. 53.

C H A P. XVIII.

Ver. 6. TO uncover her nakedness. לְגַלּוֹת עֶרְוָה. Sep. ἀποκαλύψαι σκεχόμενῃ*—Vulg. ut revelet turpitudinem ejus; and so equivalently all the other versions. And perhaps *shame* would be here a more proper word than *nakedness*.

lb. I, the Lord, forbid it. There is, in the original, only אֲנִי יְהוָה, *Ego Jehovah!* commonly rendered, "I am the Lord." But this, to me, appears rather a frigid version; and I would, with the judicious Arab. translator Saadiah, supply the words *so command*, or *so forbid*, according to the exigency of the text.

Ver. 7. The nakedness of thy father, that is, the nakedness of thy mother, &c. That the copulative *and* in this verse is to be rendered by *that is*, and not by *or*, as in our com. version, is clear from the context, although the antients have paid no attention to it. All the precepts are addressed to the male, as the principal agent in such unlawful violations of pudicity. In this particular prohibition the turpitude of the crime is pointed out as doubly criminal, in as far as *uncovering the nakedness* of a mother is a grievous injury done to the father.—Dathe, elegantly, *Verenda patris tui, hoc est, verenda matris tue, ne retegās.* Michaëlis: "Du, sohn, sollst die blöße deines vaters, das ist, die blöße deiner mutter, nicht aufdecken."

Ver. 9. Born at home, or born abroad; i. e. either in wedlock, or out of wedlock.—Note, that both here and in ver. 11, the word מוֹלֶדֶת is wrongly pointed, as if it were in the *coactive* voice, or *hiphil*, whereas it is clear that it is in the *copassive*, or *bophal*.

Ver. 16. The precept contained in this verse gave rise to a violent controversy, about the beginning of our English Reformation. The real, or pretended, scruples of Henry VIII. about the validity of his marriage with his brother's widow, being communicated to his bishops, it was deemed proper to propose the question to the most celebrated Universities of Europe for their decision. Their decisions in general were, that, if the prior marriage were consummated, the posterior one was absolutely unlawful. But those good casuists seem to have forgotten, or to have overlooked, the other precept in Deut. 25. 5. where there is no word of consummation, or non-consummation, but merely the want of children in the defunct brother, which was evidently the case with respect to Prince Arthur. Either then the precept in Levit. was in contradiction with that in Deut. or it was not unlawful for Henry to marry the wife of his brother, who had died without issue. Nay, if the laws of Moses, in this respect, are supposed to bind Christians, Henry was obliged to marry his brother's widow, to raise up seed to his brother. But, indeed, the reasonings in favour of a dissolution of that marriage were a tissue of scholastic sophistry, supported by the more solid argument of despotic power; not to mention the English gold which was spent on that occasion to influence the venal oracles to return favourable responses.

* The same term is used by Gr. Ven.

Ver. 21. *Thou shalt not devote any of thy offspring to Moloch.* מוֹלֶכֶת לֹא תִתֶּן לְהַעֲבִיד לְמֹלֶכֶת. Instead of מוֹלֶכֶת, the Sam. T. has מוֹלֶכֶת; and so read Sep. *απο του σπέρματος σου ου δώσεις λατρεύειν Αρχοντι*; and Vulg. may have followed the same reading, *De femine tuo non dabis, ut consecratur idolo Moloch.* This, however, is ambiguous, and may have equally sprung from the present reading. Singular is the version of Syr.: *De femine tuo non ejicias, ad gravidandam alienam.* How he could make this out of the present Heb. it is impossible to conceive; but he either read differently, or guessed at some meaning which should bear some analogy to the context; for it must be confessed, that the precept, as it now stands, comes in awkwardly, and seems to be out of its place. For the rest, the word מוֹלֶכֶת, or מוֹלֶכֶת, is the participle active of מָלַךְ, *to reign*; and in this sense it is rendered not only by Sep. *αρχοντι*, but even by Gr. Ven. *Προς τε τε σπέρματος σου ου δώσεις τῷ βασιλευσιν.* MOLOCH was probably some powerful king, to whom divine honours were paid after his death, and human sacrifices offered to him, as they were to Saturn. See the Rem. on 2 K. 23. 10. I have, with Jerom, so worded my version here, as to make it agree with either of the texts.

C H A P. XIX.

Ver. 10. *NOR shall ye go a second time over your vine-yards and olive-yards.* כִּרְמֶךָ לֹא תַעֲבֹל. The word כֶּרֶם signifies both a vine-yard and olive-yard, and indeed every thing of the orchard kind. The precept is thus rendered by Sep. *τον ἀμπελων σου ουκ επανατρογυσεις, ουδε τας ρωγας του ἀμπελωνος σου συλλεξεις.* The Syr. translator considered the first comma as relating to *ungathered grapes*, and the second to *fallen olives*, and חֲקֹמֶן לֹא חֲקֹמֶן. Vulg. *Neque, in vinea tua, racemos et grana decedentia congregabis.*

Ver. 19. The three precepts contained in this verse are perfectly agreeable to good agriculture and good economy, nor is it needful to look for any other mystery in them.

Ver. 20. I have in Explan. Note said, that I was not sure but the Sam. lection is here preferable to the present Hebrew; I shall here subjoin them in two parallel lines.

HEB.—בְּקֶרֶת תְּזַחַּה' . . . לֹא יִמְתֹּךְ כִּי לֹא חֲפֶשֶׁת.

SAM.—בְּקֶרֶת תְּזַחַּה לִי לֹא יִמְתֹּךְ. כִּי לֹא חֲפֶשֶׁת.

Now hear Houbigant: "*Hodiernæ scripturæ hæc vitia sunt. Primum, in verbis בְּקֶרֶת תְּזַחַּה, "ambiguum relinqui, cujus animadversio fit facienda, an viri, an mulieris, an amborum. "Itaque abeunt io alterutram sententiam Veteres. Gr. quidem Syr. et Vulg.* credidere, "inquisitionem, seu animadversionem fieri amborum; Chald. et uterque Arabs, folius mulieris: atque iis obsequuntur plerique Judæi recentiores; sancientes legem omnium legum "iniquissimam: ut vir, cujus peccatum gravius, non flagelletur, mulier flagelletur, quæ "virum petiisse non dicatur; imo quam Lex innuat fuisse per vim violatam—Alterum vitium "est in verbo יִמְתֹּךְ, de femina aut de viro dicto. Nam cum Lex causam subjungat talem, "כִּי לֹא חֲפֶשֶׁת, quia non libera, difficile est intelligere, cur femina, si criminis rea est, idcirco*

* He should have added Tharg. and Perf.—Gr. Ven. has only *ετασμος τελεσται.*

“ non sit morte multanda, qui non sit libera. Utrum, enim, si libera esset, morte dignior esset? . . . His vitiis, in Sam. Scriptura occurritur, dum additur לו, (quod, prope לו, fuit “ a scribis Judæis prætermissum,) ut lex animadvertat in eum cujus est culpa gravior, neque “ eum tamen mortis pœnâ condemnet, ut si liberam subegisset, quia in servæ et liberæ “ desponsatione non paria jura sunt, cum non par sit matrimonii utriusque conditio.”—It must be confessed that this is no feeble reasoning, and the author has formed his version accordingly: “ De 20 legibus quæretur; sed morte non damnabitur, quia mulier non est libera.” But he has, as far as I know, been followed by no latter interpreters, who generally follow the Vulg. *vapulabunt ambo, et non morientur*, &c. Yet the more I consider the matter, the more I am inclined to be of Houbigant’s opinion.

Ver. 23. *Its first fruit ye shall count as uncircumcised: three years, &c.* The meaning is, that the branches of newly-planted trees are not to be allowed to fructify for the first three years; which is still considered as a piece of good horticultural economy, especially with regard to vines.

Ver. 26. *Ye shall not eat upon the mountains.* The present Heb. has לֹא תֹאכַל עַל הָהָרִים, and the precept is thought to forbid the eating of blood; but this prohibition had been so often and so pressingly enjoined before, and enjoined in its proper places*, that we look not for a repetition of it here, where it comes in so abruptly. Besides, the phrase אֹכֵל עַל הָהָרִים, *to eat on the blood*, is a strange assemblage of words. “ But על,” it is said, “ is here for עַם, as appears “ from Deut. 12. 23. where עַם, not על, is in the text.” This is a poor subterfuge; for, first, granting that על here were equivalent to עַם, the matter would not be much mended: the phrase אֹכֵל עַם הָהָרִים, without any adjunct, is nearly as strange as אֹכֵל עַל הָהָרִים. The phrase in Deut. is very different; the עַם there has its regimen עִם הַבָּשָׂר: and in Levit. interpreters are obliged to suppress the על altogether, as Syr. or supply a word to make up the sentence; as *any thing*, in our common version; or *flesh*, or some such word. But it will be difficult, I think, to shew such another *ellipsis* in the Heb. Scriptures. On the other hand, we learn from Ezekiel that *eating on the mountains* was considered as a crime, and is by him classed with idolatry and other grievous transgressions†. Is it probable, then, that there should be no mention, no prohibition, made of it in the law of Moses? But if it be not here mentioned, it is nowhere mentioned. I am therefore fully persuaded that the Septuagint have alone preserved the genuine reading; אֹכֵל הָהָרִים instead of אֹכֵל עַל הָהָרִים; *Μὴ σφάξετε ἐκ τῶν ὀρέων*: which I have followed in my version.

Ib. *Nor . . . practise divination, nor augury.* לֹא תִחְזֹקׁ וְלֹא תִעֲנֹנֹו. The former denotes divination by means of *serpents*, which, as Bochart‡ has shewn, was not uncommon among the ancients. The latter means prognostications or omens from the *clouds*, or the face of the heavens, alluded to by Jerem. 10. 2: “ He who observeth the wind,” says Solomon, “ shall not sow; and he who regardeth the clouds shall not reap.” Eccles. 11. 4.

Ver. 27. *The hair of your heads, &c.* “ Les Persans,” says La Roque, “ qui rognent la “ barbe, et la rasent par dessus la machoire, sont réputés heretiques par les Arabes.” Voyage

* See Levit. 3. 17.—7. 26.—17. 10, 12, 14.

בְּזֹאת יִשְׁמְרוּ.

† Ezek. 18. 6. אֹכֵל הָהָרִים לֹא יִחְזֹק וְלֹא יִעֲנֹנֹו לֹא יִשְׁמָר אֶל נִגְלֵי.

‡ Microzoicon. pars 1. lib. 1. ch. 3.

dans la Palestine, p. 142. Yet the Arabs themselves, in the days of Herodotus, seem to have been given to similar practices.

Ver. 31. *Necromancers*. דַּחֲבֵית; or rather, as Sam. דַּחֲבֵית—Sep. and Gr. Ven. *εὐφρατισμαίαι*. They took the idea from אֵב, a bottle or bladder: because the belly of the *ventriloquist* was supposed to be inflated. Vulg. has *magi*; and so most of the other versions. Our common translation: "them that have familiar spirits."—It is pretty clear from 1 Sam. 28. 8—19. that the word means a *necromancer*. See C. R. on that place.

Ver. 35. In my Explan. Note I have said, that perhaps this verse should be rendered thus: "In the regulations of measures and weights, ye shall, &c." The Heb. is: לֹא תִשְׁקֹל עֹל בְּמִשְׁכָּל וּבְמִשְׁוֹרָה; where עֹל בְּמִשְׁכָּל, *iniquitas in judicio*, may be an elegant Hebraism, equivalent to *iniquum judicium*: and indeed I am apt to think that this is really the case. The Greek *ἐν κρίσει καὶ ἐν κλίμακας* may be taken in the same signification: so that the whole precept regards only three things, *meting, weighing, and measuring*.

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 10. *If any man commit adultery with his neighbour's wife*. Heb. אִישׁ אֶחָד יִנָּחֵם אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ [אִישׁ אֶחָד יִנָּחֵם אֶת אִשְׁתּוֹ]; where the words within brackets I consider as an interpolation. They are wanting in 3 of Kennicott's mss.; but they seem to have been read by all the antients, and may be a pure tautology; which, however, is better omitted in a translation. Our common version patches up the verse thus: "And the man that committeth adultery with *another* man's wife, *even he* that committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death;" where mark, that the whole construction is embarrassed and ungrammatical. Elegantly, as usual, Dathe: *Qui cum uxore alterius adulterium commiserit, morte afficiatur, tum adulter, tum adultera*.

Ver. 17. *It is a shameful deed*. Heb. חֲסֵד חָסֵד. It is not easy to account for such a *catachresis* of the word חֲסֵד, which every where else denotes *benignity, mercy, piety*; and I much suspect that we ought to read חָסֵד*: yet there is no variety of lection. Our lexicographers explain it thus: "The primitive meaning of the word," say they, "is *excess* of any kind: hence it signifies an excess of *fraternal love*; that is, *incest*." Michaëlis justly laughs at this rabbinical notion. His own opinion he gives in the following words: "Mihi quidem de חֲסֵד sic videtur. *Amoris* significationem habet, et vero ejus quem Greci proprio nomine *εργον*, Latini *pietatem* vocant. Hinc, *incestus cum sorore*, חֲסֵד dicitur; planè ut nos *amoris* nomine in deterius quoque abutimur." This is not very satisfactory; and better have recourse to the Syr. and Chald. in which חֲסֵד means *probrum, dedecus*. Be this as it may, the word is certainly here to be taken in a bad sense. Sep. and Gr. Ven. *αἰσχος*—Vulg. *nefaria res*—Onk. קִלְנָה—Syr. חֲסֵדָה; and so equivalently the other versions.

Ver. 20. *Childless shall they die*. עֲרִירִים יָמָיו—Sep. *αἰετοὶ ἀποθανούσιν*—Vulg. *absque liberis morientur*; and so the other versions. The only question is, whether the punishment

* See the Arab. חֲסֵד, which, with other meanings, has that of *lasciviousness*.
mss. have יָמָיו, *shall they be*.

† For יָמָיו, 2 of Kennicott's

here threatened is to be inflicted by the hand of God or by the hand of man ; i. e. whether the words be a prediction or an injunction. They admit either of the meanings ; and the idiomatic phraseology seems to favour the latter.

Ver. 26. *The Lord your God.* After these words, there is in the Coptic version this singular addition : “ who brought you out of the land of Egypt ;” and which, it is very probable, they read in their Greek copy.

C H A P. XXI.

Ver. 4. *BUT if she have a husband among his people, he shall not dishonour himself by incurring uncleanness on her account.* In the present Heb. text are only the following words : *לֹא יטמא בעל* : by our English translators rendered : “ *But he shall not defile himself, being a chief man among his people, to profane himself ;*” which, he who understands must have an acute intellect. Indeed the text, as it now stands, is unintelligible. It is clear that the law in question regards the priests, the ordinary priests, the sons of Aaron ; what business, then, has a chief of the people to do here ? Jerom saw this, and so formed his version, as if he had read *לבעל* *, as before *לאחריו* : *sed nec in principe populi sui contaminabitur* ; which makes, at least, a connected sense, adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller. Michaëlis thinks that *בעל* is here the *high-priest* : but this is highly improbable. He is never so denominated, and the law with respect to him is couched in other words in ver. 10. — Bate obviates the difficulty thus : “ *As a husband, he (the priest) shall not be defiled, &c.†*” But the word *בעל* never signifies a husband, without some adjunct. The version of Sep. is singular : *Ου μιανθησεται ΕΞΑΠΙΝΑ εν τη λαοφ αυτου, κ. τ. λ.* Such is the common reading ; but Cod. Alex. and Glasg. want *ου μιανθησεται*, and join *εξαπιναι*, &c. to ver. 3. In either case the reading is not inept ; but it supposes that not *בעל* was in their text, but *בבעל*, as in Num. 4. 20. and not *בעל*, as Capellus conjectured. But even this, to me, appears unsatisfactory ; and I am convinced that a word has been dropped out of the text, which I would restore thus : *לֹא יטמא [לבעלת] בעל ‡ בעל*. Or, if it be granted that *בעלה* may, without any adjunct, denote a *married woman*, which I doubt, the restoration of the text might consist of the addition of a single letter, or at most two letters ; and the reading be either *לבעלה* or *בבעלה*, or even *בבעל* : but I think the other amendment preferable, which leaves *בעל* as it is, and is more analogous to the Heb. idiom. This restored reading is partly supported by Vulg. Saad. and the first lection of 1 Heb. and 1 Chald. ms. which have the copulative before *לֹא* ; and partly by Sep. ; who, although they read *בלע* for *בעל*, yet must have found either *כ* or *ב* before it, since they rendered *εξαπιναι*. In short, the context itself almost demonstrates this to be the true reading, as two cases are contrasted, in one of which the priest is allowed to do the funeral duties to a deceased sister, in the other not.

* Or *בבעל*, as the Syr. translator seems to have read.

† Purver : “ A husband among his people shall not be defiled, &c.” And similar is the marginal reading of our common version : *being an husband among his people, he shall not defile himself for his wife.*

‡ As in Gen. 20. 3. and Deut. 22. 22.

§ It is well known that the π final has been sometimes dropped by the Masoretical copyists, as in *נער* for *נער*.

Ver. 7. This verse, in our public version, is a singular instance of the absurdity of a verbal translation. It runs thus: "They shall not take a wife *that is a whore, or profane*; neither shall they take a woman put away from her husband; for *he is holy unto his God.*" Who is *holy*? The *husband*, according to the version; but *any one* of the priests, according to the text. The *translation*, therefore, ought not to have been followed; and the following of it here, and in six hundred other places, renders the translation obscure and ambiguous.

Ver. 8. *Who have swallowed them.* כֹּהֲנִים. For so rightly the Sam. T. and so Sep. *ὁ ἀγίων αὐτῶν*. It is here question of the *priests*, and not of the people at large.

Ver. 12. *The badge of holiness.* Although both texts have here only כֹּהֵן טָהוֹר, yet I cannot help thinking that a word has been dropped, and that the text originally was כֹּהֵן טָהוֹר וְשָׂמַן שִׁטְמוֹ. The כֹּהֵן, or badge of holiness, is never elsewhere joined with שִׁטְמוֹ, and indeed had no connection with it: it was a part of the *tiara*, or *mitre*, and is expressly called *the badge of holiness*, כֹּהֵן טָהוֹר, in Exod. 29. 6, 7. The addition, however, I have put in *Italics*, as it is a mere conjectural emendation, unsupported by any text or version.

Ver. 14. *Nor an barlot.* In the present text there is no copulative before כֹּהֵן, which made our English translators, with their usual scrupulosity, put *or* in *Italics*. But כֹּהֵן is the reading of Sam. and was that of Sep. and the other versions marked in Var. Read.

Ver. 18. *Maimed.* חֲרִים. Sep. *καλοῦσεν*—Vulg. *parvo naso*—Onk. retains the Heb. word—Tharg. חֲרִים בְּחֻמְסָא דְלֵךְ—Syr. חֲרִים—Sam. ver. חֲרִים—Saad. חֲרִים—Erp. חֲרִים—Gr. Ven. *σιμος*. There is, then, a pretty general concurrence in favour of some *defect* about the *nose*; yet I take the meaning of חֲרִים to be, simply, *maimed*, from the Arab. حَرَمَ, *secare, mutilare*. So Dathe: *five membris juxta longioribus*. But Michaelis sticks to *nose*: "Keiner dem das nasenbein eingedrückt ist." Our common version: "He that hath a flat nose." To me it appears that the word is in contrast with that which follows; and that, as the latter denotes something *superfluous* in the person, the former denotes a *deficiency*. Hence the *Erpenian Arab.* has well rendered both חֲרִים וְנֶחֱסֵם.

Ver. 20. *Extenuated.* קָרַךְ. Sep. *ἐφελος**—Vulg. *lippus*—Onk. קָרַךְ—Syr. קָרַךְ—Sam. ver. קָרַךְ—Saad. קָרַךְ—Erp. קָרַךְ—Gr. Ven. *σλασθής* †.—I think that the *Erp. Arab.* has again properly rendered the Heb. word, which gives naturally the meaning of *gracilis, extenuatus*.

Ib. *Pearl-eyed.* Heb. בִּלְלִי בְּעֵינָי. Sep. *πῖλλος τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*—Vulg. *albuginem habens in oculo*—Onk. בִּלְלִי בְּעֵינָי—Syr. בִּלְלִי בְּעֵינָי—Saad. בִּלְלִי בְּעֵינָי—Erp. בִּלְלִי בְּעֵינָי—Gr. Ven. *λελευκωμένος ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς*—The version of *Aquila* seems to have been *ὀφθαλμοῖς*; that of *Sym.* λελευκωμα, which accords with *Vulg.* *Rosenmüller* thinks it may signify *blear-eyed*, which *Aquila's* version favours. Dathe, *albuginem habens in oculo*.

Ib. *Or have a dx. or purulent scab.* Heb. מִן הַדֶּחַ אוֹ מִן הַשִּׁבְיָה—Sep. *ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ δέχου ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπιγίου*—Vulg. *habens jugem scabiem, vel impetiginem in corpore*—Gr. Ven. *σπιγίον ἢ ἐρπετιον*. The other versions either retain the Heb. terms or use others that denote *some sort of*

* The meaning of this word is uncertain. According to *Hesychius*, it denotes one who has *mil-spots* in his face; according to others, one having *bloodshot eyes*.

† The Latin, *nanus*; so that this and *Syr.* favour our common English version, *dwarf*; but better is the marginal reading, *too slender*. Bate, not badly, *consumptive*.

‡ So the word is printed; but what it means I know not.

scab; but the latter seems to be a *purulent* scab, or species of leprosy, called *impetigo Egyptiaca*.

Ib. Or *having a rupture*. מרר מרר—Sep. μονορχμς—Vulg. *herniosus*—Onk. מרים מרר—Tharg. Jer. מרר מרר—Syr. מרר מרר—Saad. מרר—Erp. מרר מרר—Sam. ver. מרר מרר—Perf. מרר מרר—Gr. Ven. τελευσμενος τον ορχαν.—Thus the authorities are divided; but Vulg. Saad. and the Perfic version seem to have best understood their original; for, the word מרר, as Rosenmüller observes, is not to be derived from מרר, but is the participle passive of מרר; and the meaning of the two words is *inflatus testiculos*, or, as Perf. *tuberosos habens testiculos*. Dathe, however, follows the common version, which is that of Onkelos, *in testiculo confusus*: and so our vulgar version, who *hath his stones broken*. Michaëlis; “keiner, dem das “ männliche glied verlesset ist.”

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 22. *LACERATED*. ררר. Sep. γλωσσομητος—Vulg. *cicatricem habens*—Onk. ררר—Syr. מרר—Saad. מרר—Erp. מרר—Sam. ver. מרר—Perf. מרר—Gr. Ven. τετραμητος.—The majority is then for *lacerated*, or *cut*; and etymology evidently points that way.—Our common version, *maimed*. Dathe, *laceratum*. Michaëlis leaves it untranslated, “rather than adopt any of the faulty versions of the antients.”

Ib. *Having the rot*. ררר. Sep. μυρμακωω—Vulg. *papulas habens*—Onk. ררר, rendered in Pol. *papulas habens*, but without any good authority—Syr. ררר, *weak, distempered*—Saad. ררר, *having warts*—Erp. ררר, rendered by Castell. *verrucosus*, but which should, I think, be rendered *marcidus*—Sam. ver. ררר, *rotten*—Perf. ררר, *having a flux*, which always accompanies the *rot* in sheep, and which the Heb. word itself also denotes. I have no doubt; then, of its being *the rot*. Our common version, *having a wen*. The Gr. Ven. seems to have had some such idea in view when he rendered μυρμακωω. Dathe follows Sep.: *myrmecis affectum*. Michaëlis: “krank.”

Ib. *Having the dry, or purulent, scab*. The Heb. words are the same which have been explained before in ch. 21. 20.

Ver. 23. *Which hath any superfluity*. ררר—Sep. ωστομητος—Vulg. *aure amputatus*. So equivalently Syr.; but all the other versions, even Gr. Ven. have words that denote *excrecence, superfluity*, &c.; and so our common version.

Ib. Or *deficiency*. ררר—Sep. νολοχαμικος—Vulg. *caudā amputatus*. And so Syr.; but the rest have words denoting *something wanting, deficiency*; and the word is evidently contrasted with the preceding one. Both terms are well rendered by Perf. ררר ררר, member-abounding, or member-lacking. Well, also, Gr. Ven. υπερεταμενον η βεβραχυμενον.—Dathe: *membro corporis vel longiores, vel breviores*. Michaëlis: “das ein glied des leibes zu “ lang oder zu kurz hat.” Our common version: “that hath any thing superfluous or lacking in his parts.”

Ver. 24. *What hath been emasculated, either by constriction, or contusion, or evulsion, or excision*. Four modes of emasculating are here enumerated. The Hebrew words are—

מערך—כרות—נתוק—כרות—by Sep. rendered, ~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—
 Vulg. *quod vel contritis, vel tufis, vel scellis ablatisque testiculis*. Onk. כרית—כרית—כרית—
 Syr. . . . —כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—Sam. ver. כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—
 כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—כרית—
 Gr. Ven. ~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—~~κατασχεμασμεναι~~—
 So uncommon a coincidence in almost all the versions is a strong proof that the Heb. words have the meaning here assigned to them, and that they denote four different modes of castration practised in the days of Moses. One reason for this prohibitory law may have been, as Michaelis observes, to deter the Israelites from the castration of men, practised by the neighbouring nations. See *Mo-
 nisthes Recht*. part iii. sect. 168. p. 158.

C H A P. XXIII.

Ver. 9. I HAVE said, in Explanatory Note, that this, and a part of verse 10, would be better out of the text. It is clear, that the speech of the Lord to Moses is continued from verse 1, without interruption, to the end of the chapter, which altogether relates to the various festivals, and the manner of celebrating them: The phrase, then, *Again the Lord spoke to Moses*, &c. is a needless repetition, both here and in verses 23, 26, and 33. But as these reiterations are in both texts, and in all the antient versions, I durst not throw them out.

Ver. 10. *The first-reaped sheaf*. The word rendered sheaf is עמר, which signifies also a certain measure called an *omer*; and Delgado finds fault with our translators for not so rendering it here. But our translators did right to be guided by Sep. and the other antient versions, which all have words that denote a *sheaf*. Even the Gr. of Venice has *το δρυγμα*, the very word used by Sep.; and indeed etymology confirms this rendering: עמר, in Arabic, signifies *to bind, a bundle*, &c. The Egyptians offered the first-fruits of their fields to Isis. See Diodor. Sic. lib. ii.

Ver. 14. *Toasted grain rubbed out of the full ear*. קלי וברסל; commonly rendered as if they were two different things, as in our public version, “nor parched corn, nor green ears.” But from a comparison with ch. 2. 14. I am convinced that we are to consider the words as a *beniady*, and that they mean only one thing, namely, *full ears* of corn *toasted*, or *parched*. So Sep. understood them, without noticing the copulative before כרסל: *αρον, και πεφρυγμενα* *καρσλ*. *καρσλ*.

Ver. 24. *To be commemorated by shouting*. זכרון תרועה: by Sep. rendered *μνηστικον σαλ-
 πινος*—Vulg. *memoriale clangentibus tubis*; from whom our English version: “a memorial of
 “blowing of trumpets.” But there is no *trumpet* in the original, as Delgado well remarks;
 and all the other versions, save the Arabic of Saadias, have words that simply denote *shouting*,
 or some similar term. Excellently Gr. Ven.: *μνηστικον αλαλαγγου*. It may, however, be, that this
 shouting was accompanied with the blowing of *trumpets*, or rather *horns*; and the Alexan-
 drian Gr. translators might, from that usage in their time, render as they have done. Jerom
 followed them.

Ver. 36. *It is an assembly day.* עֲצֻרַת דָּוָה. Sep. ἐξόδος ἡμέρας—Another Gr. ver. apud Basil. πικνωσιν—Vulg. *est enim cœtus atque collecta.* So equivalently Onk. Tharg. Syr. Erp. and Perf.—Sam. ver. עֲצֻרָה, the Heb. word—Saad. וְאַמְכַּרְתָּהּ בִּי קְדֻשָּׁתָהּ, *ye must remain at the holy place*—Gr. Ven. καλυμα ἡμέρας—Our English version: “it is a solemn assembly;” which I take to be the real meaning of the Hebrew, only the word *solemn* is not necessary. Some modern critics, however, are of opinion, that עֲצֻרָה, from the Arabic عَزَرَ *to press*, denotes a festival held when the grapes were to be pressed, or the *wine-press feast*. So Michaëlis and Rosenmüller: but, to me, this appears to be a forced interpretation; and I would rather, with Hezel, follow Sep. and render, *the close of the festival**; or, as the Scots call the Epiphany, *Up-baly-day*; i.e. the last of the Christmas holidays. But still I prefer *assembly*, as I cannot well see what other term would be so suitable to the context, and as עֲצֻרָה must be so rendered in several places. See 2 K. 10. 20; Nehem. 8. 18; Isa. 1. 13; Joel, 1. 14.—Dathe has, *Feria sunt*. The marginal reading of our public version: “It is a day of restraint.”

Ver. 40. *Shoots of luxuriant wood.* פֵּרִי עֵץ וְדֹרֶר—Sep. καρπὸν ξύλου ὡραίου—Vulg. *fructus arboris pulcherrimæ*; and so nearly all the versions, save that some of them, such as Onk. Syr. and Saadiah, determine the fruit to have been *citrons*, or *oranges*; and so Josephus expresses it. But whatever might be the usage in the days of Josephus, or the practice of more modern Jews, it is not probable that the *citron-tree* was known either in Egypt or Palestine so early as the age of Moses. See Hezel’s excellent note on this place.—The Israelites might take the *fruit*, or *shoots*, here mentioned from any *goodly*, or, as I render, *luxuriant*, tree.—For the rest, I am inclined to think that פֵּרִי here means not *fruit*, properly so called, but young growing *shoots*, or *boughs*†, as in our public version; although Delgado finds fault with it on that account, and although the bulk of commentators are on his side. Houbigant, however, has *furculos*, and Junius has *termetes*; but Dathe, *mala citria*, and Michaëlis, “citronen.”

C H A P. XXIV.

Ver. 6. *IN two piles.* שְׁתֵּי מַעֲרֹת. Sep. duo *Separata*. Jerom renders the whole verse thus: “Quorum senos *altrinfecus* super mensam purissimam coram Domino statues;” an ambiguous paraphrase, rendered still more ambiguous in the Douay translation: “which thou shalt set six one against another upon the most cleane table before the Lord‡.”—There is, indeed, some seeming ambiguity in the text itself, as it is not very clear whether the loaves were to be arranged in *rows* along the table, or in upright *piles* upon the table. But the size of the loaves, and the small length of the table, appear to be decisive for the upright piles; and a better version than that of Sep. cannot be given. The loaves, then, were placed in two piles, each pile containing six loaves.

Ver. 7. In Explan. Note I have said, that perhaps the uppermost loaf of each pile was

* So our Matthew: “It is the end of the feast.”

† So in the text; but, in the margin, *fruit*.

‡ Or, as in Chaloner’s revision, “And thou shalt set them, six and six, one against another,” &c.

burned with the incense and salt, which *salt* I have added partly on the authority of Sep. and partly because in ch. 2. 13. all *donatives* are ordered to be *seasoned with salt*. Now the *presence-loaves* may, I think, be considered as a sort of *donative*, out of which a portion was to be burned upon the altar; and in ver. 9 it is expressly said, that those loaves were given to Aaron and his sons, as their share of the Lord's burnt-offerings, *וְהָיוּ לָהֶם*.—I know that *לֶחֶם*, in ver. 7, may be rendered, *in lieu of bread or food, vice panis*; or, as Dathe, *quæ panis loco fit**: but this is certainly not the most natural interpretation; it is more probable that *לֶחֶם* here has the same meaning with *לֶחֶם* in ch. 2. 13. and that *לֶחֶם יָדָה* means, *for the Lord's portion of food*, whether it were the incense and salt only, or these together with two of the loaves.

Ver. 11. *Having mentioned the name of the Lord.* The Heb. has only *וְקָבַל הָשֵׁם*, *nuncupavit nomen*. Sep. *ἐνομιμασεν τὸ ὄνομα*—Vulg. *cum blasphemasset nomen*; and so, indefinitely, all the other versions, except that the Bab. Tharg. tells us that it was *the great and venerable name which had been heard at Sinai*, *וְהָיוּ לָהֶם קָרָא דַּמְתַּרְשָׁא דְשִׁמְעָא בְּסִינַי*; and it is the general opinion of the Jewish interpreters that *Jehovah* is here to be understood. This notion I have followed in my version, although I confess it is not indisputable. Houbigant has combated it with some specious arguments: “Si Dei nomen homo Ægyptius blasphemavit, vel id nomen fuit a scribis, non a Mose prætermissum; vel *שֵׁם* nudè positum idem valet ac *יְהוָה*. Id vero ultimum ex sacris paginis non vincetur; in quibus nusquam videas *שֵׁם*, solitariè usurpatum, pro *יְהוָה*, vel pro *יְהוָה שֵׁם*. Nam soli Judæi Rabbini scriptis in suis usurpant talem scribendi formam. Jam hominem Ægyptium blasphemasse Dei nomen; Dei inquam Israelitarum, non sui, parum credibile videtur. Nam cum post narretur, eum hominem fuisse in custodiam traditum, donec Moses ex Deo resciret, quomodo in eum animadversum esse oportet, quis credat Dei verbis indiguissè Mosen, in blasphemix supremi numinis crimine deprehenso et palam facto? Aiunt quidem novi interpretes, nondum certam pœnam blasphemis fuisse constitutam. Sit ita sanè: an idcirco dubitârît Moses, hominem in Deum blasphemum ultimo delere supplicio? Ante hæc tempora fuerat sancitum, ut si quis patri vel matri male diceret, morte damnaretur: quanto erat morte dignior, qui Deo male dixisset? Quod si dixeris, ideo dubitâsse Mosen, qui is homo non quidem Deo maledixisset, sed Dei nomen adversario maledicendo usurpâset, reclamat lex ver. 15. *Si quis Deum suum blasphemaverit*; sanciens contra eum qui Deum ipsum suum blasphemiam laceffivit. Nam ex sanctione ipsa sancientiæ legis occasio, qualis fuerit, internoscitur. His animadversis, superest ut is homo blasphemus in Deum fuerit, sed suum; atque ut ob id eam ipsam causam Moses anceps fuerit, de tali numinis, quamquam falsi, contemptu, quid esset statuendum, et ut propter eandem causam narrârît, hominem eum fuisse patris Ægyptii filium, cò ut intelligeretur fuisse eum religione tali, quali nascendi origine. Quare ver. 15 sancitur *Si quis Deum suum blasphemaverit, portabit peccatum suum*. Quod ne credas in Deo tantum vero sancitum, altera lex continuò subditur *Qui autem blasphemârît nomen Domini, morte afficietur*. In qua ultima lege blasphemia in supremum numen tangitur; quo modo in priori blasphemia in Deum qualemcunque, quem tu cùm colas, tamen ei maledicas; non modò

* Michaëlis: “Dis ist die Speise und das Opfer für Jehova.”

“ ne longiùs dimanet exempli talis contagio, sed quia id fiebat conscientia iudice et accusatrice. Ille autem homo extra castra educitur, lapidatione interficiendus; non item qui verum Deum blasphemat, ut educio ipsa extra castra significet, de ejus blasphemia nihil pertinere ad Dei veri cultores.—Nunc quæres, quid fiet de verbo **דָּשָׁא**, quod deum nec verum nec falsum demonstret? Credo equidem id vocabulum, seu rectè seu corruptè id scriptum habemus, indicasse deum quemdam Ægyptiorum; nisi fortè scribæ nomen dei falsi, quem non nôssent, omiserint. Ait quidem Castellus, vocabulum **דָּשָׁא** significare apud Samaritanos Deum: quod si esset, legi posset **דָּשָׁא Deum suum**. Sed potestatem inducit Castellus parùm testatam. Nam quæ duo exempla profert, unum *Exod.* 34. 5. alterum *Deut.* 28. 58. in priori lacunam fecere Londinenses, quia post **דָּשָׁא** abest **יְהוָה** in Sam. versione: in posteriori malè interpres Samarita verbum Heb. **דָּשָׁא** interpretatur per nomen **יְהוָה**; cùm id nomen in contextu Heb. Mose sequatur: vide, si juvat, Polyglotta ad duos locos supradictos.”—Thus Houbigant, whose reasonings will to some, I doubt not, appear extremely plausible, but which are, for the most part, but specious inferences from questionable premises. The only thing that looks like a solid argument is derived from the apparent distinction which is made in verses 15 and 16; of which, presently. Meanwhile, I think it clear that, in verse 11, **דָּשָׁא**, the name, (*ναὸς ἐξοχώ*), is equivalent to *Jehovah*; which, however, I believe to have stood originally in the text here, as it still does in ver. 16; although its elision must have been made at an early period, as it is wanting in Sep. and in the Sam. text.

Ver. 15. *Whoever revileth his God, let him bear his sin.* **וְהָאֱלֹהִים וְהָאֱלֹהִים וְהָאֱלֹהִים**. The question here is, What is meant by **אֱלֹהִים**? Some think that it means not any God, but the judges, or magistrates. So Drusius, Le Clerc, and Rosenmüller: “*Quicumque magistratibus suis imprecatus fuerit, pœnas peccati ferre debet: אֱלֹהִים hic significat magistratus*, ut *Exod.* 28. nam de Deo est vers. seq. Nexus cogitationum in hoc et sequenti vers. est hic: Si jam is, qui magistratibus suis maledixerit, pœnas luere debet; tanto magis plectendus est is qui tale crimen erga Deum commiserit.”—But I believe no one, who has read the whole context with attention, will be ready to adopt this opinion. What gives rise to the injunction is not the reviling a magistrate, but reviling the name of some god or other: the injunction, therefore, must be relative to this alone. But, still, what is meant here by *his God*? Any one's own god, (say some interpreters,) whether a false god or a true God*. So Schulz: “*Quicumque Deo suo, five verus five falsus is sit, maledixerit poenam luat*.”—This interpretation I consider as more inadmissible than even the former; for, is it in the smallest degree credible that the Lord *Jehovah*, or Moses in his name, would announce to the Israelites (for to them the law is addressed) that reviling even a false god was a crime worthy of punishment? He who takes every occasion to place all gods, except the God of Israel, in the most contemptible point of view!—But how, then, account for the contrast between verses 15 and 16? There is no contrast, but a most proper climax. In verse 15 is a general precept, forbidding every Israelite to revile his God under any name whatsoever; but the reviling him under the appellation of his great name **יְהוָה** is to be punished with immediate death, and by the same sort of death as had been just inflicted upon the Ægyptian proselyte, who

* Philo was of this opinion.

had reviled *that* NAME, **השם**.—It is remarkable that in ver. 16 the same *ellipsis* occurs as in ver. 11, בנקבו שם יומת, where the Sam. copy has **השם**, as in ver. 11; for the prefix is here of importance. This repetition of **השם**, without any adjunct*, overturns Houbigant's reasoning on the **השם** of ver. 11; for here it can refer only to Jehovah, the God of Israel.

CHAPTER XXV.

Ver. 5. *THE grapes that grow without pruning.* **אֶת עֵנְבֵי נֹזֶרֶת**; by Montanus literally rendered *was separationum tuarum*.—The ancient translators conjecture variously. Sep. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי נֹזֶרֶת**—Vulg. *was primitiarum tuarum*.—Onk. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—Tharg. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—Syr. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—Sam. ver. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—Saad. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—Erp. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—Perf. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—Gr. Ven. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**—The difficulty lies in ascertaining the meaning of the word **נֹזֶרֶת**. Le Clerc imagined that it was here to be taken in the same sense with **נֹזֶרֶת**, a Nazarite: "Vocat **נֹזֶרֶת** vineam non putatam, translatione a Naziræo "duclâ; ejus per Nazircatûs tempus ut cæsaries non tondebatur, sic palmites, qui sunt "comæ vitis, septimo anno non putabantur." This explanation, although scouted by Houbigant, was adopted by Michaëlis, and again rejected by Rosenmüller, who gives his own interpretation in the following words: "Equidem **נֹזֶרֶת** in eodem sensu, quo Clericus, sumo; "sed id exponere mallet vineam a qua separasti te, dum eam non coluisti; vineam non cultam "sive putatam: igitur **אֶת עֵנְבֵי נֹזֶרֶת** erunt *vasa* qua nascuntur in vineis tuis, septimo anno, non "putatis."—That this is the general meaning of the comma I have little doubt; but I differ from both Le Clerc and Rosenmüller as to the precise signification of the word **נֹזֶרֶת** here. I think it has nothing to do with the common acceptations of **נֹזֶרֶת**, not even with **נֹזֶרֶת**, a Nazarite; but I would refer it either with Houbigant to **נֹזֶרֶת**, a branch, *surculus*, or rather to the Arab. **נֹזֶרֶת**, *viruit, fronduit*—*comam produxit arbor*. See Castell.—The Syr. translator seems then very properly to have rendered, and his version was with reason adopted by Houbigant: *nec racemos palmitum tuorum decerpes*. But he commits a double mistake in his note; 1st, by writing the Syr. term **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק** instead of **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**, and 2dly, by assigning to the **שֶׁבֶק** of Onk. the same signification. It is true that **עֵבֶר שֶׁבֶק** is found in the Chald. paraphrase on Ezek. 17. 6; but Elias Levita justly remarks, that **שֶׁבֶק** seems to be the true reading; and of this, indeed, I have no doubt.—For the rest, the true reading in the comma which has been the subject of this remark is **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק** in the plural; which is that of Sam. 12 Heb. mss. Vulg. Syr. and P. P. ver. 11.

Ver. 10. *A year of jubilee.* The precise meaning of the word **יובל** is not well ascertained. Onk. Tharg. and Perf. retain the Hebrew term, which Vulg. only Latinizes, *Quia jubileus est*; but Sep. **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**, and so equivalently both Arabs; and the **פְּרִיָּה** of Syr. comes to the same point. The idea seems to be drawn from the consequences that attended the

* In Sep. indeed, there is *no* **אֶת עֵנְבֵי שֶׁבֶק**; as if they had read in their copy **השם יומת**. And so Vulg.: *nomen Domini*. But all the other versions have only *the name*. Yet I have little doubt that **השם** was originally in the text in both places, if the original text be so old as Moses, or even as Solomon; for the rabbinical scruple of not writing or pronouncing the name *Jehovah* is of a much posterior date.

jubilee rather than from the etymon of the word, which denotes the *trumpet*, or *horn*, by which the jubilee was announced: hence the Gr. Ven. has *κρας τελεση υμιν*. Some, however, would derive יובל from the Syr. יבל, *deferre, deducere*: but why not, as well, from the Hebrew root itself, in the signification of *transfere*?—It may be worth observing here, that the jubilee of the Jews gave rise to the papal jubilee, or year of *plenary indulgence*, as it is termed, first instituted by Boniface VIII. and fixed at a period of one hundred years; but reduced to fifty by Clement VI. to thirty-three by Urban VI. and at last to twenty-five by Sixtus IV. in 1475.

Ver. 30. *That is in a walled city.* The present Heb. text has *אשר לא חמה*, which made the Masoretic Ainsworth render, "in the city that hath *not* a wall." But James's translators did right to follow the *Keri* reading *לר*, which is that of Sam. 15 Heb. mss. and of all the antient versions.

Ver. 33. This verse runs thus in the present Heb. and Sam.: *אשר ינאל מן הלויים ויצא ממנו*; by our English translators rendered, "And if a man purchase of the Levites, then the house that was sold, and the city of his possession, &c." But this is inconsistent with the context, and different ways have been taken to amend the passage. Houbigant, finding in the Vulg. "*si redemptæ non fuerint*," &c. imagined that Jerom had read, in his Hebrew copy, *לא* before *ינאל*, and accordingly adopted that reading in his version, "*Quare aliquam domum si quis Levita non redemerit, irrita erit in Jubilæo venditio domus ejus.*" But this cannot be the meaning of the legislator, and is contrary to the whole tenor of the laws in favour of the Levites. It is not, therefore, here, but in the following part of the verse, where the error lies, but which is rectified by the Septuagint, who read not *ויעיר*, but *ויעיר*, which, I have no doubt, was the original reading, and which sets all right: only *אשר ינאל מן הלויים* must not be rendered "If a man purchase of (i. e. from) the Levites," but "If it be any of the Levites," &c.; *Qui ex Levitis*. So Dathe: "*Sed si, qui redemerit, sit de Levitis, cessat jus domus venditæ in urbe quam Levitæ possident anno jubilæo.*"—Michaelis: "Und wenn ein Levite das haus seines verwandten durch den wiederkauf an sich bringt, so wird auch das verkaufte haus im Jubeliabr wieder frey," &c.

Ver. 35—38. These laws concerning *usury* would be absurd in a commercial nation; but the Hebrew republic was not intended to be a commercial nation, and the laws against *usury* seem to be well calculated for the general good of the community. See Michaelis's *Mosaïsches Recht*, vol. iii. sect. 154. or his *Comment. de mente ac ratione legis Mosaicæ usuram prohibentis*, printed with other dissertations at Göttingen in 1767.

C H A P. XXVI.

Ver. 1. *FOR the purpose of adoring at them.* *לדחות עליהם*; commonly rendered, as in our public version, "to bow down to it." So Sep. *προσκυνησαι αυτω*; and Vulg. *ut adoratis eum*. I cannot think that this is the meaning. The preposition *על* after the verb *שחך* never, elsewhere, precedes the object of adoration. See Gen. 47. 31; 1 K. 1. 47; 2 Chron. 7. 3;

If. 60. 14; Ezek. 46. 2; Zophon. 1. 4. It every where, in ~~the~~ construction, signifies either *upon*, *towards*, or *at*: and here both the Erpenian Arab and the Persic translator have well rendered, the former by עָלֶיךָ, the latter כִּדְךָ *versus*. Even Gr. Ven. ~~ἐπὶ τὸν~~.

Ver. 5. Jarhi's note on this verse is excellent: "Nam erit tritura copiosa; ~~voluptas~~ in illa
" occupati eritis usque ad vindemiam, et in vindemia eritis occupati usque ad tempus sationis."
Shakspeare has imitated this in the Tempest, where the wife of Ceres is,

Spring come to you, at the farthest,
In the very end of harvest!

Ver. 13. *The bands of your yoke.* מִטּוֹת עֹלֶיכֶם. Sep. τὰ δεσμοὶ τὰ ξύγχα ὑμῶν—Vulg. *catenas*
cervicium vestrarum.—מִטָּה, or מִטָּה, was a *rod*, or *bar*, bent into an oval form to fit it for the
ox's neck, the two ends of which, passing through the wooden yoke, were kept fast to it
by pins.

Ver. 16. *With diseases.* The present Heb. text has בִּדְלוֹה, by our English translators rendered
terror, as if the word were from בָּדַל. So also Jerom understood it, but in a different sense: "vi-
" fitabo vos *velociter* *." I am persuaded that the true reading is that of Sam. בִּדְלוֹה; but do
not think, with Houbigant, that ב is here a preposition, or that the root is בָּדַל. I believe the
root to be בָּדַל, and the meaning of בִּדְלוֹה to be a *nausea*, which for the most part precedes a
consumption. I am persuaded that this was the reading of Sep. and not בִּלְדוֹה, as Houbigant
imagined. Their ἀσπασ is, in my opinion, wrongly rendered *egestas*; I think it expresses that
debility and *disquietude* which accompany a *nausea*; for, although they nowhere else render
בִּדְלוֹה by ἀσπασ, they employ the latter to express similar terms. Thus, Deut. 28. 22. שָׁחַפְתָּ
is rendered ἀσπασ. In like manner they employ the verb ἀσπασω to express the Heb. דָּוָה, *lan-
guidus*, Jerom. 8. 18; and אָנָּה, *angor*, Gen. 32. 7. Nay, in Zach. 4. 8. the word in
question, בִּדְלוֹה, as a verb, must, I think, have been rendered in Sep. by ἀσπασω. What
sense can be made out of any of the present readings, ἐπείσθητε, ἐκώσθητε, or ἐκώσθητε?—Were
we to trust the Latin translator of Syr. we should class him with Sep. and Sam.; but I doubt
if רָדָה will bear to be rendered *phthisis*, or even *debilitas*, as in Castell; and I think that Syr.
read בִּדְלוֹה in his copy, as well as all the other antient interpreters whose versions remain; for
we have lost those of Aquila, Theod. and Sym.; so we cannot tell what word they read.

Ib. *Consumptions.* רָדָה. Sep. ῥαπα—Vulg. *in egestate*; and so equivalently Onk.:
but both Arabs and Perf. have words that denote a *consumption*: and this I take to be the true
meaning of רָדָה. See the Arabic رَدَا in Castell or Golius.

Ib. *Fevers.* רָדָה. Sep. ῥαπα—Vulg. *ardor*; and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. Perf.
and Saad. Even Gr. Ven. has τὸν πυρετὸν. There is little doubt that it means a *burning fever*,
from קָדַח, *exardescere*. Jarhi: "Dicitio denotat morbum qui inflammat corpus, idque calidum
" et tumidum reddit." The effects of the consumption and of the fever are beautifully con-
trasted in these words: מְכַלֵּת עֵינַי וּמְדִיבֹת נַפְשִׁי; which I render, *shall waste your eyes and
wring your hearts.* See Explan. Note.

Ver. 22. *Which shall rob you of your children.* וְשָׂלָה אֶתְכֶם. Lit. *shall bereave you.* Sep.

* So likewise Saadias.

and Jerom seem to have read הַמִּזְבֵּחַ , or perhaps הַלֵּל , as the former have κατεδεται , the latter *confumant*. But all the other versions follow the present reading.—Gr. Ven. has very properly $\text{καὶ ἀτεκνωται ὑμᾶς}$.

Ver. 30. *Tutelar statues*. זִמְתֵּי Sep. ξύλοι χαροποιῆται —Vulg. *simulacra*—Onk. זִמְתֵּי —Syr. זִמְתֵּי —Sam. ver. retains the Heb. word—Saad. זִמְתֵּי —Erp. זִמְתֵּי —Perf. זִמְתֵּי —*sun-boufes*—Gr. Ven. αὐχέσταται .—The learned reader will readily perceive that almost all these versions are vague conjectures. The Heb. word is generally classed under the root זִמַּח ; and because זִמַּח signifies *beat*, and because the sun is the source of heat, זִמַּח is supposed to signify a *solar statue*, that is, an obelisk dedicated to the sun. I am apt to think that the true meaning of the word is to be sought in the Arab. زَمَن , to *protect*; and that זִמְתֵּי were statues erected to the *genii protectores*, or *tutelar gods*. See Kircher Oedip. I. 173.—However, as the other opinion is not without probability, and is at present more generally received, I would erase *tutelar statues*, and write here *sun-images*, as in 2 Chron. 14. 5.

Ib. *On the carcases of your idols*. The Heb. word rendered *carcases* is the same as is used in the next comma, פָּרֵץ ; but here it must be taken in a metaphorical sense, denoting the *fragments*, or *stumps*, of the idols.

Ver. 31. *Your sanctuary*. The present Heb. has זִמְתֵּי , *your sanctuaries*; and so seem to have read Sep. Vulg. Onk. Saad. and Gr. Ven. Hence some moderns interpret the word as meaning sanctuaries dedicated to profane divinities. But this, I think, cannot be the meaning, whether we read in the plural* or in the singular; which latter, זִמְתֵּי , is the reading of Sam. Syr. Erp. Perf. and of not less than 50 Heb. and 2 Chald. mss. To which join the Complutensian edition of Heb. and 4 editions of Onkelos. Comp. Ps. 74. 7. and Ezek. 9. 6.

Ver. 39. *Their enemies*; for, hither the mark || should be removed, and *their* written for *your*. The present Heb. indeed has *your enemies*, אֹיְבֵיכֶם ; and so Onk. || and Perf.—But Sam. Sep. Sym. Theod. Vulg. Syr. both Arabs †, and even Gr. Ven. with above 80 Hebrew mss. and several of the oldest editions, have *their enemies*, אֹיְבֵיהֶם ; so that there is little doubt of this being the genuine reading.—For the rest, there seems to be a misarrangement in the present text, which was not in the copy of the Septuagint, who thus render the verse: $\text{Καὶ ὡς καταλεφθέντες ἀπὸ ὑμῶν καταφθαρεῖσθαι διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν τακῆσονται}$. This appears to be the more natural order, which I have followed in my version. Compare the order in the next verse.

Verses 40, 41. I have said, in Explan. Note, that the sense of this passage is strangely confounded in almost all the versions. I shall content myself with giving three examples.—Sep. $\text{Καὶ ἐξαγορεύσουσι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν, ὅτι παρεβήσαν καὶ ὑπερέδον με, καὶ ὅτι παρεβήσαν ἐναντίον μου πλῆγαι, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐκορεύην μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν θυμῷ πλῆγῃ, καὶ ἀπέλω αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ γῇ τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἐπ' ἐναντίον μου ἢ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἢ ἀπεριτμήτος, καὶ τότε ἀδοκῶσιν τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ, κ. τ. λ.}$ —Vulg. *Donec constentur iniquitates suas et majorum suorum, quibus prevaricati sunt in me, et ambulaverunt ex adverso mihi. Ambulabo igitur et ego*

* The Septuagint render not ἀγίασμα , but ἀγία , by which they more frequently express the sanctuary, ωρθ ; so that it is uncertain whether they read here ωρθ or ωρθ . Gr. Ven. has likewise τα ἱερά , not τα ἀγίασματα , the word by which he is wont to render ωρθ .

† Beside the Rutilian Arab, and the Barberini Arab. Sam.

contra eos, et inducam illos in terram hostilem, donec erubescat indignitatis mens eorum: tunc orabunt pro impietatibus suis.—Common English version: “If they shall confess || their iniquity” and | the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they trespassed against me, and “that also they have walked contrary unto me; and that I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their unrighteous hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity: then, &c.”—Now, none of these versions, in my opinion, express the real meaning of the original. The first of them is the least exceptionable; as by the change of a single word, the fut. *confitebuntur* into the aorist, and by giving to *non* before *confitebuntur* the meaning of *non tamen*, which I think it will bear, and then by considering *non tamen* and what follows to *exspectant autem* inclusively as a parenthesis, all will be clear and consecutive.—The Vulgate, as it stands, is irremediable; nor do I find any variety of lection either in Hentennius, or any copy that I have seen. The version of the Vulg. was, however, followed by our first translators, even down to the Genevans, who all render *אלך* and *דבארתי* in the future. But James’s revisers saw the impropriety of this, and tried to remove it thus. They make the first colon of ver. 41 a part of the confession of the people in their distress*; and, to connect it with ver. 40, thrust in an Italic *that*, and render both the verbs just now mentioned in the præterite. This, at first sight, seems to reconcile the Text with itself; but I am persuaded it is not the true meaning of the text; for, what need was there to *confess* that the Lord had *walked contrary to them, and had brought them into the land of their enemies*, when they are already supposed to be in the land of their enemies, and under the Lord’s rod of affliction?—Of all the antient translators, Tawusi alone seems to have understood his original; his Persian version of ver. 41 being *כי כן תתוודע בך כי יפלה נדב בערכך כפשות ליהוה*, &c. Among moderns, the version of Houbigant comes nearest to the point; and would, with very little variation, be perfectly clear: “Tandem [si] peccatum suum et parentum ipsorum confitebuntur [confessi fuerint], quo ipsi et patres eorum me offenderunt, et iram meam [ita] provocaverunt, ut ego, eis insensus, in terram hostium ipsorum eos deportarem, &c.”—This, I think, is undoubtedly the meaning; but, for the sake of greater perspicuity, I judged it better to include in a parenthesis the words that create the difficulty; and leave to the sagacious critic to say, whether the context does not require such a rendering.

C H A P. XXVII.

Ver. 2. *IF any one will distinguish himself, &c.* *איש כי יפלה נדב בערכך כפשות ליהוה*; rendered by Montanus thus: “Vir cum separaverit votum in ordinatione tua animarum Domino.”—Sed quis hæc intelliget? Nemo, Hercule! nemo.—Nor much more intelligible is our common version: “When a man shall make a singular vow, the persons shall be for the Lord by thy estimation.”—By whose estimation? “By that of Moses,” say some; “By that of the priest for the time being,” say others. But the words are addressed neither to Moses nor to

|| It is remarkable, that, in the earlier editions, these three words are wanting; but inserted in posterior editions.

* In this they had been preceded by Castalis, Junius, Piscator, the Tigurines, and others.

the priest; but to the children of Israel. To apply the ערך to either the priest or Moses, then, is confounding ideas, and introducing an *anacoluthon*, to which, I believe, there is no parallel.—But let us turn to the antient interpreters; who are, at least, consistent. Sep. 'Ο; αὐ ἐξήται εὐχην ὡς τιμὴ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ * τῷ κυρίῳ—Vulg. *Homo qui votum fecerit, et spondederit Deo animam suam, sub estimatione dabit pretium.* So equivalently Onk. Tharg. and both Arabs, who all considered the ך final as a paragogic letter, or understood the word impersonally, as I do. Delgado's note is judicious: "The Heb. substantive ערך, *estimation* or "value, is never found in Scripture but with the pronoun of the second person joined to it; and which is an *expletive*, having no use but to distinguish it from the meaning of an ordinance, or laying in order."—Houbigant's version is, *quarum estimation sit habenda.* But better, perhaps, that of Dathe: "Si quis votum fecerit, quod homines spectat, *estimari debent*, &c."†—I have given a somewhat different turn to the colon, which, I am persuaded, gives the true meaning.—For the rest, in rendering the word פלג, I have followed Aquila and Theod. who have βαυμασιωγ.

For the political reasons for the varieties in the valuation, see Michaëlis's *Mosaïsches Recht.* vol. ii. sect. 124.

Ver. 16. *An homer of barley-seed.* The word *homer* is never to be confounded with *omer*; or, as others write it, *gomer*; the Heb. term for the latter being עמר with an *ain*, of the former, עמר with a *beth*.—An *homer* was a measure containing ten *eph*s. See the Table of Measures.

Ver. 29. *No man, even, who hath been so devoted, may be redeemed: he shall surely be put to death.* בל חרם אשר חרם מן הדמים לא יפדה מות יומת. Sep. Παν [ἀναθημα] ὃ εἰς ἀναθεὴν ἀπο τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐ λυτρωθήσεται, ἀλλὰ θανατῶσι θανατωθήσεται—Vulg. *Omnis consecratio, quæ offertur ab homine, non redimetur; sed morte morietur.* And so, equivalently, all the ant. translators down to Gr. Ven. who very literally and strongly renders thus: Παν ἀναθημα, ὅπερ ἀναθεὴν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐ λυτρωθήσεται, τῷ θῷ καὶ θανατουσθεῖ. That the Heb. words will bear no other meaning is to me as clear as meridian light; and, indeed, it is but of late that any other meaning has been attempted to be forced upon them. We are, however, now gravely told, that מות יומת signifies not *that he shall be put to death*, but *that he shall remain dedicated to the Lord's service until the day of his death*. If any one can put up with this interpretation, he may.

A somewhat more plausible way of getting rid of the difficulty is, to say that the persons here ordered to be put to death were only such as had been otherwise devoted to utter destruction, such as the Chanaanites. So Houbigant: "Non alios licebat anathemate voveri, quam Chananæos, quos jufferat Deus ad internecionem deleri."—So, likewise, Rosenmüller: "Intelligendus sine dubio hostis in bello internecioni devotus . . . nam servos aut liberos aut alios innocuos homines devovere non multum differret a crudeli consuetudine eorum, qui victimas humanas mactarent: quod Moses graviter damnat Deut. 12. 31." But even this interpretation is forced, and inadmissible. There is not a single word of Chanaanites, or other ene-

* Houbigant thinks they read נפש: but there is no need of so supposing; they probably read as we now do, but considered *souls* here as equivalent to any *one* individual of *many* souls.

† I wonder that Michaëlis and Rosenmüller were here guided by Le Clerc,

mies, in this whole chapter; and the וְהָיָה, or *devoting to death*, here mentioned, evidently regards persons of any kind belonging to the man who chooses to devote them.—More rational and specious is the explanation of Capellus, which I have partly expressed in my Explanatory Note. It was, he thinks, like the law about divorce. God did not approve divorces; but, on account of the hardness of the Jews' hearts, permitted a man to divorce his wife, when he was of such a temper that he would not live with her. Just so, although God did not absolutely approve of any one's being devoted to death; yet, to prevent such rash vows, he would, if they were made, have them fulfilled.—“But,” says a deceased friend of mine, in a ms. note, “I can never conceive that God commanded one man to be killed, because another had made a rash vow.” Neither can I conceive it. But the question is not, what we conceive, but what is the precise meaning of the law. Now I affirm that it can have no other meaning than that which is given in our common version, namely, that the person devoted by what is termed וְהָיָה, *berem*, was absolutely to be put to death. That the Israelites themselves understood it in this light, is clear from the case of Jephthah; for it is an absurd interpretation to say that his daughter was not to be sacrificed, but only condemned to the service of the tabernacle, and a life of virginity; as I shall show in due time and place. Meanwhile I will repeat, that the word וְהָיָה has never any other meaning than *utter destruction*, whether it regard a single person or whole nations; nor can any example be produced where it will bear a milder interpretation.

But it will be urged, Is not this altogether contrary to Levit. 18. 21. and 20. 2. and more especially to Deut. 12. 31? To this I answer, that I am not obliged to reconcile contradictions, wheresoever they may be found. Yet let us see whether the passages be so irreconcilable as they may at first sight appear. In both places of Levit. the Israelites are forbidden, under pain of death, to devote their offspring to *Moloch*; but there is no prohibition to devote them to *Jehovah*. In Deut. indeed the injunction is clearer: it forbids imitating those nations who, in honour of their gods, burned their own children; and declares that this practice is *most abominable and hateful to the Lord*. Is this to be considered as a formal repeal of the injunction in Levit. 27. 29? Or is it absolutely compatible with it? Are *children* virtually excepted in the law of Levit.? Or does the law of Deut. abrogate the whole of the former? Or, in fine, is it only the *manner* of *devoting* that is forbidden in Deut.?—I have fairly stated the case, and leave every one to think of it as he pleases.

Ver. 32. *That passeth under the tithing rod.* אֲשֶׁר יַעֲבֹר תַּחַת הַשֶּׁבֶט. Sep. וְהָיָה כִּי יַעֲבֹר תַּחַת הַשֶּׁבֶט—Vulg. *quæ sub pastoris virga transeunt*. So also Syr. and so equivalently all the other versions. That שֶׁבֶט is here a *rod*, or *staff*, there is little doubt; yet the meaning of the phrase is disputed. Dathe, followed by Rosenmüller, thus explains it: “*Quæ in pastorum custodia aut cura sunt.*”—I believe the meaning to be, that the titheman numbered the sheep, &c. with a rod, and separated each tenth one. I have seen sheep counted in this manner.

NUMBERS. CHAP. I.

IT is disputed whether the general muster reported in this chapter be the same with that of Exodus 30. 11. and 38. 25. The round number is precisely the same, but the time seems different. The muster mentioned in Exodus must have been made in the first year from the exit out of Egypt, and before the tabernacle was erected; whereas this is said to have happened in the second month of the second year.—Michaelis * has laboured to show that there was only one *muster*, but divided into two *acts*. In Exodus, the people were registered in different tables by their respective centurions and decurions, for the purpose of levying a poll-tax for the construction of the sanctuary: but here these different registers were reduced into one by Moses and the chiefs of tribes; in doing which, no regard was paid to the diminution or increase of numbers that must have happened since last year. Those who had died during that period were still supposed to be alive; and those who had but just arrived at the twentieth year were not counted. This is ingenious; but has no other support than the identity of numbers, which I cannot consider as a solid proof. It is well known that the Hebrew historians were seldom wont to express small numbers; and it is here observable that *fifty* is the smallest number in any of the sums: and even this number occurs only twice; all the rest end with *hundreds*. But is it in the smallest degree probable that none of the numbers should end with forty, thirty, twenty, ten, or even with a smaller fraction? I think, not; and therefore believe that round numbers were given to make up a round sum-total: and this sum's agreeing with that in Exodus may have been the fruit of design, to show that the people had not diminished.—For the rest, the numbers here, and often elsewhere, seem to be greatly exaggerated. Six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty men, besides the whole tribe of Levi, all the males under the age of twenty, and all the women of every age, (who must have amounted to twice the former number at least,) encamped together in the desert of Sinai, is a thing hardly credible.

Ver. 3. *From the age of twenty years, upward.* Plato, in his *Republic*, makes his males fit for war from the age of twenty to sixty. The Hebrew legislator marks no ultimate period.

Ver. 24. This and the following verse are in Sep. transposed to after ver. 37 in all the editions, save Compl.; the editors of which appear to have brought them hither in conformity to the Hebrew copies; for all the mss. which I have yet seen agree with the other editions.

Ver. 51. *Any other person.* *אֲחֵר*; in our common version rendered *the stranger*; but it here means any one who is not of the tribe of Levi.

Ver. 53. I have, in my version, made a small transposition of the last comma of the verse, for the sake of perspicuity; but nothing is changed in the meaning.

* *De censibus Hebr.* in Comment. Societatis Regiæ Gœtting. Preleſſio; and in his *German Notes* on Numbers.

C H A P. II.

Ver. 14. **DEUEL**. דְּעוּל. The common Hebrew text has דְּעוּל, *Reuel*; followed by our vulgar version: but Sam. Sep. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. Saad.* with above 100 mss. and the old edition of Soncino of 1488 †, have *Deuel*; and so the name is written ch. i. 14. and ch. 10. 20.

Ver. 31. *According to their standards*. לְדִלְהֵיהֶם. Sep. κατὰ ταγμῶν (or ταγματῶν) αὐτῶν.—By Vulg. the word is entirely omitted, as well as by the Latin translator of Onk.; but not by Onk. himself, who, with Tharg. has לְדִלְהֵיהֶם *per ordines*: and so equivalently Syr. and both Arabs.—Gr. Veb. τὰς σημαίας αὐτῶν.—I suspect that לְבָנֵיהֶם was the original reading; but I find no vestige of it either in Kennicott or De Rossi.

C H A P. III.

Ver. 1. *THE progeny of Aaron (and of Moses) were these*. I have included *and of Moses* in a parenthesis, because perhaps it may be an interpolation; yet it is in all the copies of both texts, and in all the versions, without any variation, save that in Saad. it precedes Aaron. The Heb. words are, אֵלֶּה תְּלִדֹת אַהֲרֹן וּמֹשֶׁה—Sep. Αυταί αἱ γενεαί Ααρων καὶ Μωϋση—Vulg. *Hæ generationes Aaron et Moysi*; and so equivalently all the other versions. It is well known that the meaning of the word תְּלִידֹת is not limited to actual generation; it sometimes signifies *progeny*, by adoption, as the verb from which it is derived signifies *to adopt*. See Deut. 32. 18; Ps. 2. 7; and Jerem. 2. 27. It also signifies the *events* that happen in a family; as in Gen. 38. 2: so here it may signify the occurrences that happened in the family of Moses and Aaron †. Still, however, I am apt to think that the word is here to be taken in its first or secondary meaning; and that, as I have said in my Explan. Note, the progeny of Aaron is considered as the progeny of Moses also; his own sons being born of a stranger. This idea seems to have struck the Arabic translator Saadias, who thus renders the comma: וְדָוִד נִסְבָּה קִיּוֹם מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן, *This is the progeny of the family of Moses and Aaron*. Dathc: *Hæ fuit progenies Moysi et Aaronis*—Michaëlis: “Das geschlechtregister Aharons und Mose stand folgender-massen.”

Ver. 31. *Their charge was the ark, &c.* One might have expected that this primary and most honourable office would be committed to the *Gersonites*, as being the elder branch of

* That is, in the Paris and London Polyglotts: for the ed. of Constantinople, according to De Rossi, has *Reuel*; which is also the reading of Syr. Arab. Erp. and Perf. The Greek of Venice has a very singular reading, ὡς ἐξου-
 ελίου, if this be not a typographical error.

† Besides a Pentateuch of the fifteenth century, in quarto, and another in folio, mentioned by De Rossi.

‡ Commodè verti potest: *hæ sunt quæ in familia Aaronis et Moysi contigerunt*; de iis enim agit totum hoc caput. Vocem autem Hebræam non solum *generationes* significare, sed etiam *ea quæ in familia aut cognatione aliqua contigerunt*, apparet ex Genesi 37. 2. Quanquam hic etiam familia Moysi nominatur, tamen in capite ipso Aaronis tantummodo familia describitur. Cognatio igitur Moysi et Aaronis tanquam una consideratur; et quidquid de Aarone scribitur, de Mose etiam narratur.” Rosenmüller in loc.

the progeny of Levi; but Moses and Aaron were *Koathites*, and it was natural for them to prefer their own family*.

Ver. 39. I have excluded from the text the words *and Aaron*, on the authority of Sam. Syr. and 12 mss. They are, however, in all the other versions, without excepting Sep. in all the copies which I have seen; but it is remarkable that they are wanting in the Coptic version made from Sep.; and indeed they are now pretty generally allowed to be an interpolation. Even in the common Masoretic text the letters are marked with dots above, thus: *אֶהְיֶה*: most probably to point out that they were to be considered as interlopers. Their extrusion makes this verse consistent with ver. 5. where only Moses is commanded to number the Levites.

Ib. *Twenty-two thousand*. "Here," says (very honestly) Delgado, "appears a seeming contradiction: the total of the Levites expressed here is 22,000; and, summing up the number of particular families, we find them to be 22,300. But the rabbins tell us, from tradition, that the 300 could not serve to ransom the first-born, as they themselves were first-born."—Such is the Jewish solution of this difficulty: let us now see how Christian interpreters have cut the knot.

De Lyra, Munster, Olcaster, Tostatus, Cajetan, De Muis, Ainsworth, and even Le Clerc, adopt the rabbinical hypothesis, namely, that neither the first-born of the Levites nor the priests of the race of Aaron were comprehended in the 22,000 mentioned in ver. 29, although they made a part of the three sums mentioned in ver. 22, 28, and 34. But this explication is very justly exploded by Bonfrerius, who observes, that it is incredible, not to say impossible, that in the number of 22,300 persons there should be only 300 first-born.

Others, among whom Houbigant and Michaëlis, account for the present difference thus: they suppose that, in ver. 28, where the sum of the Koathites is given, the original reading was not *שש מאות* 600, but *שש מאות* 300. The lapse was certainly easy, and the conjecture has every degree of probability which a conjecture can well have. It is enhanced even by the disproportion of the present sum of the Koathites, 8,600, exceeding so much the other two, 7,500 and 6,200.

Dr. Kennicott took another method, but of a similar kind. He conjectured that the number had been changed, ver. 22, in the number of the Gerphonites; and that instead of 500 we should read 200. But, besides that this reduces too low the proportionate number of Gerphonites, the conjecture is founded on an uncertain hypothesis that the Hebrew historian expressed numbers by single letters; and here wrote *ר* *resb* instead of *י* or *capb* final †. This solution is therefore given up, I believe, by almost all latter critics.—The conjecture of Houbigant is far more natural; yet as all the copies, both Heb. and Sam. as well as all the versions, have in ver. 28 the same number, 8,600 ‡, it has been attempted to reconcile the num-

* "Cujus rei ratio sine dubio hæc fuit, quod Moses et Aaron ex ea Caathitarum familia essent." Rosenmüller.

† This too is against Kennicott's hypothesis; for I am persuaded there were no final *capbs* in original copies; nor is there an instance, I believe, where the Greek translators mistook a *resb* for a *capb*, or *vice versa*; which they might readily have done if the final *capb* had then existed, as they have often done with regard to *resb* and *dakth*. There is no final *capb* in the Sam. alphabet.

‡ It is a mistake in Schulz to say, "Pro *xx* legerant Septuaginta *על*." They have, uniformly, *εξακαιχιλιοι και εξακοσιοι*; and the Coptic version has the same number.

bers in the following manner. In the first place, it is laid down as a postulate that the number in ver. 39 cannot be 22,300, for this reason, that it would be greater than the number of the first-born of the other tribes, 22,273; which sum is, in ver. 46, said to be less than the first-born of the Levites, by 273; therefore the sum 22,000, in ver. 39, is the true sum.—This will be readily granted; but how is this sum to be reconciled with the sum of the Koathites, in ver. 28?—Why thus: The surplus of 300 Levites, arising from the three sums in ver. 22, 28, 34, are to be deducted, as being themselves first-born, and, in that quality, already consecrated to God, and consequently could not stand as a redemption-price for others. This is the solution of Hezel, Schulz, and Rosenmüller, and, in fact, the same with that of the rabbins and De Lyra; consequently, liable to the same objections: for, in the first place, how is it known that those 300 Levites were first-born; or that, if first-born, they were not by Moses accounted in the sum-total of the Levites*?

But, in this hypothesis, another knot is yet to be untied, which Rosenmüller himself confesses to be a puzzling one: *fatendum est difficultatem hanc esse momenti haud exigui, sed tentari saltem debet illius explicatio.*—Well, let us see how the attempt will succeed. The difficulty lies in Bonfrerius's objection, already mentioned: Is it credible, that, among the Levites, there were only 300 first-born, when in each of the other tribes, at an average, there must have been 1,855?—Even this number of first-born, of a people who are said, in another place, to have above 600,000 men fit for war, is very few. “Incredibilis primogenitorum paucitas in populo qui habebat 603,555 ætatis militaris, quibus adhuc addendi masculi inter primum expletum mensem et vicesimum annum, id vero est, pœne omnes viginti annos nondum nati. Sed si etiam de hoc numero remittamus, et, pro binis adultis in censum relatis, sumamus singulos modo fuisse natu minores, quam ut numerari deberent, tamen oriuntur ex 42 Israelitis singuli tantum primogeniti, quod primâ fronte incredibile.”—Such is the statement of Rosenmüller himself with respect to the paucity, in general, of the first-born of the Israelites. “But the difficulty,” says he, “is at least diminished, if not entirely done away, by considering, 1st, that in the computation are not to be included those who, although first-born, were already-married, and had families of their own: 2dly, that, in all such families where a female was the first-born, there could be no first-born male: 3dly, that, in the most numerous polygamist families, none was to be accounted a first-born, but the *father's* first male

* “Quis poterit, non docente Mose, rescire Levitarum primogenitos esse ex censu eximendos? Constat ipse Celericus, non a quovis id potuisse intelligi. Ergo nihil erat, cur id Moses attento lectori permitteret supplendum. Nam nullibi docet Moses Levitarum primogenitos Deo esse, præ ceteris Levitis, dicandos; et tale commentum nihili esse vincit ipse Moses. Nimirum, postquam dictum est primogenitos filiorum Israel, censu habendo, repertos fuisse 22,273, addit Moses ver. 46. eos primogenitos plures esse Levitis numero 273. Ex quo planum fit, id *לְבִי* *וְיִשְׂרָאֵל*, *supra Levitis*, quod extat ver. 46. numerum Levitarum indicare ver. 39 notatum, nempe 22,000. Nam falsè diceret Moses ver. 46. numerum filiorum Israel 22,273 superare numerum Levitarum, si Levitæ essent numero 22,300; vel si Levitæ trecenti essent, quorum non esset habitus census. Quippe *superesse*, non alium numerum, qui superetur, potest indicare, quam eum, qui supra notatus est, nempe numerum 22,000.”—Houbigant.—I confess, I do not see what good answer can be given to this. That of Rosenmüller is certainly a lame one: “Sed observanda est Moyses, sicuti omnium Hebr. scriptorum, consuetudo, ut alia sæpius repetant sine necessitate, alia autem reticeant, et lectori supplenda permittant.”

“offspring.”—Of these ~~three~~ arguments, the second only is of weight; the two others are mere assumptions. It is nowhere said that married first-born were to be exempted: all the first-born males, without exception, are ordered to be redeemed, from the age of one month upward, without any limitation of time or situation in life. The last argument is founded on an evident misapprehension: it supposes that it was the *father's first-born male* that was only to be numbered, whereas it is clear that it was the mother's first-born, כָּל־בְּכוֹר פֶּטֶר רֵדָה. See ch. 3. 2. and 8. 16; also Exod. 13. 2, 12, 15; and 34. 19. So that if a man had four wives, and each of these brought him a son for *her* first child, they must all be accounted first-born. Still, then, the small number of first-born, even of the other tribes, is scarcely credible; but in regard to the Levites, in the supposition that they had only 300 first-born, it is hardly possible.

On the whole, then, I cannot but acquiesce in the opinion of those interpreters who think that, in ver. 28, a letter has been dropped out of the text; and that, for *וְעַד*, we should read *וְעַד*.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 1. **ALTHOUGH** the words *and to Aaron* seem to be an early interpolation, and are wanting in 10 Heb. and 1 Chald. mss. as also in the printed edition of the Jerus. Tharg.; yet as they are in Sam. and all the versions, I have retained them in the text, which, however, would be more analogous without them.

Ver. 3. *From the age of twenty-five years.* The present texts, both Heb. and Sam. have *לְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה*, thirty years; and so all the versions, save Sep. which, in my opinion, has alone preserved the true reading; which is that of P. P. ch. 8. 24. as marked in my Var. Read.—By Rosenmüller and others the number *thirty* is defended, and reconciled with ch. 8. 24. in this manner. In that chapter, say they, it is question only of selecting Levites for the general service of the tabernacle, but here of selecting Levites for carrying it and its utensils; an office which required the full vigour of age. This is taking for granted what was to be proved.—In ch. 8. 24. there is no distinction made in the age of the Levites who were to *attend to the service of the convention-tent*, לְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה בְּעֹבְדֵי אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד; and surely the carrying of the tabernacle and its utensils was a part of that *service*. The only distinction there made is of those who had passed their fiftieth year; after which they were dispensed from the harder *service* of the tabernacle, but still ministered with their brethren at the convention-tent.

Ver. 32. *By name, &c.* בְּשֵׁמָם. Hence some commentators imagine that every utensil had its peculiar name, like as the two columns of Solomon's Temple, which were called *Jachin* and *Boaz*. I believe that the phrase here means no more than that every utensil was *named*, or *told over*, to the persons who were to carry them; or perhaps every board, &c. had its peculiar mark, by which it could readily be replaced in its own situation.

C H A P. V.

Ver. 6. THAT the law couched in this and the following verses is the same with that in Levit. 5. 20—26, only expressed in somewhat different terms, is clear from the general tenor of both, and from the penalty annexed to each. But a new case is here supposed, namely, that no person claims compensation; in which case it goes to the priest.

Ver. 16. *This the priest shall present, &c.* In our public version the relative pronoun *hæ* is referred to the woman: "And the priest shall bring *hæ* near," &c. But *hæ* must be referred not to the woman, but to her *donative* *. The ant. versions are, indeed, generally ambiguous, because the words that express *donative* and *woman* are both of the same feminine gender. Thus the *avry* of Sep. may have for its antecedent either *yvry* or *Swry*; yet the *cam* of Vulg. † can hardly be referred to any other word than *oblatis*: and the Douay translators have accordingly well rendered, *offer it*.—The Greek of Venice makes a curious distinction between the *hæ* of the first comma and the affix *π* of the second comma: the former it refers to the *donative*, the latter to the *woman*: Προσφέρει τὴν *hæ* αὐτῆς ὁ ἱερεὺς, ὅστις τὴν *cam* ἐννοεῖται τὴν *avry*: and I am not sure but that this is a just distinction. But, on the whole, I am rather inclined to think, that both the pronouns relate to the same thing, that is, to the *donative*; and have, with Jerom, followed that idea in my version, taking the affix of *π* to be the same with the preceding *hæ*.

Ver. 17. In the preface to my first Volume of the Bible, I have said, that this law "appears to be rather an ingenious *terriculum* than a practical part of permanent jurisprudence." I here give Secker's note on the passage: "I remember no instance of this water of jealousy either producing the effect of the curse, or the effect mentioned ver. 28, or indeed of its being ever used. The rabbins say it was left off, in the latter days of the second temple, by reason of the multiplication of adulteries, i. e. on the man's part; for they understand ver. 31 to say, that, if the man was guiltless, the water would have its bad effect on the woman; else not: and it may be so understood ‡. This trial was not to be used but when the truth could not be otherwise known. Had it been appointed without divine authority, it would never hurt any, unless consciousness produced the effect, or unless something more than is here appointed was mixed with the water §. But as the latter of these things is, at least, possible—and as, when the water did no hurt, it could scarce ever be proved that the woman had been guilty and the husband not guilty—and as we know not whether this trial was often or ever made—the proof which some draw from it from the divine ori-

* "Quidam intelligunt *mulierem*: sed male: verbum *hæ* enim semper adhibetur de oblatione sacrificii, aut ferti." Rosenmüller.

† Quia sacrificium zelotypiæ est, et *oblatis* investigans adulterium offertur igitur *cam* sacerdos, et statuet coram Domino.

‡ I think it cannot be so understood.

§ From a gentleman who resided some considerable time in Sierra Leon, I have learned that a similar practice prevails among the Mandengoes and Bullamites, and is considered as a religious rite. The water is impregnated with the bark of a tree called *Macra*. The composer and administrator is generally a priest. The effects are fatal when the person who drinks it happens to be *poor*; but for the *rich* the potion is not so powerful. When the subject escapes immediate death, she is left in a debilitated state, and commonly dies in less than a year after.

"ginal of the Law of Moses seems not very strong."—So far the archbishop; to which I add, that this law, at least, has so little the appearance of a divine origin, that it is unworthy of an upright human legislator. The injustice of it consists in this, that there is no brand of infamy put upon the man, even when the woman, who undergoes the ordeal, is pronounced guiltless; no compensation made to her for falsely and publicly defaming her. As a political device it may be in some measure defended: the Hebrews, like all the eastern nations, were excessively jealous; and, although themselves polygamists, could not brook the smallest deviation from conjugal duty in their wives. Hence a little pious fraud was deemed expedient to remove their too often ill-grounded suspicions, and this religious ceremony instituted for the purpose, and at the same time to deter wives from perjury when they were conscious of guilt *. Those who wish to see a great deal on this subject may consult Michaëlis's *Mosaisches Recht*. part v. sect. 263.

Ver. 18. *The corrosive execration water.* מֵי הַמָּרִים הַמֵּאֲרִים. So the Heb. text; but Sam. has מֵרִים instead of מָרִים; and 1 Heb. ms. has מֵאֲרִים for מֵמָרִים. The antients vary in rendering these words. Sep. το ὕδωρ του ελεγχμου του επικαταρωμενου ταιτου †: but how they could render either מָרִים or מֵמָרִים by ελεγχμου, it is not easy to conceive. Houbigant thinks they may have read in their Heb. copy either מֵמָרִים from מָרָה, or מֵמָרִים from מָרָה †. But although the verb ελεγχω, or its derivatives ελεγχος, ελεγχεις, ελεγχες, occur above ninety times in the Septuagint version, it never expresses either of the Hebrew roots which Houbigant supposes them to have read here: it is generally the coercive voice of יָחַד which they render by ελεγχω, as their ελεγχος is the representative of תְּכַחֵד. It is my belief that here they read מֵמָרִים, or perhaps מֵמָרִים, both which will bear to be rendered ελεγχος: and I am even inclined to think that this was the original Samaritan lection, as the Samaritan version has מֵמָרָה.—The paraphrase of Vulg. is, *aquas amarissimas, in quibus cum execratione maledicta congeffit*—Onk. מֵי מֵרִים מְלֵטִים—Tharg. מֵי מֵרִים בְּדֹקָה—Syr. מֵי מֵרִים בְּדֹקָה—Both Arabs, أَلْفَا أَلْفَا—Perf. מֵי מֵרִים לַעֲנֵת כִּנְאָן—Gr. Ven. ὕδατα πικρα καταρωμενα. All these translators seem to have read מֵמָרִים, and to have considered it as denoting *bitter*, except Sep. and the Sam. interpreter, who had before them the same reading, whatever it were, and understood it in the same manner. In the supposition that this is the genuine reading, the first comma might be thus rendered, *the proof-water*; a meaning perfectly agreeable to the context, and a most proper epithet for the water in question. However, as there is no vestige of such a reading in any Heb. or Sam. copy of the text yet discovered, I was unwilling to think that they have been all uniformly corrupted, and have tried to make a suitable meaning out of the text as it now stands; I mean in the Sam. copy; for I consider מֵמָרִים as the true reading, and make it

* "Sponte quisque intelligit, symbolicum hunc fuisse ritum, cui quidem nulla vis inerat, sed qui tamen mulierem "adulterii ream a perjurio detertere potuit." Rosenmüller. † So Var. with Ox. Canon. and Theodoret.

But Ald. Compl. Alex. Glasg. Sar. have το επικαταρωμενο ταιτο; and so seems Aulfm to have read in his old Ital. The Copt. ver. also favours this reading; and in ver. 24 even the Var. copy has το ὕδωρ το επικαταρωμενον: so that this seems to be the genuine reading. † Drawing his conjecture from Prov. 18. 7. where מָרָה is rendered ελεγχεται. But this single instance is too slender a prop on which to found a rational conjecture, especially as מָרָה and מֵרִים bear little or no resemblance.

a part of the verb כָּאָר *, to fret, rankle, corrode, and accordingly have rendered "corrosive-water."

Those who follow the present Heb. reading make מַרְרִים a part of the verb מָרַר; and, with our common version, render "the bitter water." But what made it bitter?—It is so called, say some commentators, because the husband brought his wife to this trial in a *bitter* disposition, *animo amaro*. Others, with more reason, that the water was so denominated from the *bitter* effects it was to produce in the guilty person: this they chiefly infer from ver. 24 and 27, where לַמֵּרִים is commonly rendered to embitter; or, as it is in our public version, "and become bitter;" or, as Rosenmüller expresses it, *ad acerbos dolores excitandos*. Houbigant has strenuously combated this idea; but his note is too long to be here inserted, nor is his reasoning altogether conclusive. But neither is the argument derived from the לַמֵּרִים of ver. 24 and 27 conclusive; for even there 3 Sam. mss. have לַמֵּרִים. Dathe, indeed, endeavours to strengthen it by observing, that the interchange of the epithets, that is, putting מַרְרִים before לַמֵּרִים in ver. 24 and 27, evidently leads to this meaning: "Ex qua epithetorum permutatione planè constare putem, hæc esse illius synonyma, idcoque de effectu esse intelligendum."—I grant that the effect to be produced (in the supposition that the person has been guilty) is here expressed by the word that is transposed †, whether it be לַמֵּרִים, or מַרְרִים, or מְבַרְרִים; but I deny that any one of these words is a synonymous term with מַרְרִים. The only question is, which of the three lessons is the most likely to be genuine; or, in other words, whether we are to call this water *bitter*, *corrosive*, or *convictive*. They who approve of the first reading must render *bitter*; I, who prefer the second, render *corrosive*; and the Septuagint, who seem to have read the last reading, favour the *convictive*, or *proof-giving*. The learned reader will judge for himself, and adopt what seems best in his own judgment.

In the rendering of מַרְרִים, the antients are all agreed; except Syr. and the Sam. translator: the former has בִּרְרָא, the latter מְבַרְרִים; whence Houbigant formed his version: *aquam pudicitie exploratricem*. In this he has not been followed—the version of Dathe is, *aquam perniciosam imprecationum*—Michaëlis has only "das fluchwasser"—Hezel: "das giftige fluchwasser," *the venomous execration-water*.

Ver. 27. *Her womb shall be inflamed, and her thigh fall down.* צַנְתָּה בְּנֶפֶל וְתֵצֵא יֶרֶךָ—Sep. *πρησθισεται την κοιλιαν, και διωπεσεται ο μηρος αυτης* ‡—Vulg. *inflato ventre, computrescet femur*; and so equivalently most of the other versions—Josephus calls it a sort of *dropsy* §—and Michaëlis will have it to be that rare disease called *hydrops ovarii*.—I should rather take it to be a *prolapsus uteri*.

* Houbigant here objects to the authority of the Sam. copy, because the word is otherwise written without an *מ* in ver. 23, 24, and 27—"Sic ut eorum in scriptura nihil sit autoritatis, propter ejus inconstantiam." But Houbigant had not examined the ms. copies of Sam. several of which have מַרְרִים in all those places, namely, six in ver. 23, four in ver. 24, and three in ver. 27.

† It is observable, that in Sep. the words are arranged in the same manner in all the places, except in ver. 24, and even there the Complutensian edition follows the common arrangement.

‡ Gr. Ven. *οδησει η γαστρις αυτης, και πινεται ο μηρος αυτης.*

§ *τα δε σκαλους εκτεινεν αυτη, και την κοιλιαν ηδεν καταλαβοντος.* Antiq. l. iii. c. 11. n. 6. p. 183.

C H A P. VI.

THERE have been, in all times and in every nation, enthusiasts, who have wished to signalize themselves by a more than ordinary devotion, rigidity of manners, and severity of discipline, under the various denominations of Nazarites, Pharisees, Dervises, Brahmins, Monks, and Hermits. Egypt, superstitious Egypt, was, most probably, the cradle of this superstition*. Hence it gradually spread over all the eastern, and a great part of the western, world. Moses seems to talk of it as an already established institution; and the manner in which he introduces the subject appears to me (as it did to Lefis†) an argument that he did not much approve of it, since the rules which he prescribes for the Nazarite are more calculated to deter than to allure.—The word נִזְרִי, in ver. 2, is in our common version rendered *shall separate*; not improperly corrected by Delgado into *shall act marvellously*. I have preferred the version of Lefis: *Si quis conspicuum se reddere cupiat*, “If any one will distinguish himself.”—So, elegantly, Sep.: ὅς αὖ (or εὖ) μεγάλως ἐκζητᾷ εὐχην.

Ver. 3. *Vinegar*. חֲמֶצֶת. The word denotes *fermentation* of any kind; and may here mean *subacid* drink, whether from wine, or fruits, or herbs.

Ib. *Nor any thing that is expressed from grapes*. כָּל מִשְׂרַת עֲנָבִים—Sep. ὅσα καταργαζέται ἐκ σταφυλῆς—Vulg. *quidquid de uva exprimitur*; and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. Bab. and Pers.: but the other versions have words that denote *maceration* rather than *expression*. Even Gr. Ven. has βρεγμα: and, indeed, the radical meaning of the Hebrew word seems to point that way. “Les Arabes,” says Laroque, “ont une boisson composée d’abricots, de raisins, et d’autres fruits secs, qu’ils mettent infuser dans l’eau, dès le jour précédent.”—May not the מִשְׂרַת of Moses have been some such liquor?—The Septuagint word καταργαζέται will admit this meaning, which is followed by Dathe: *quidquid ex uvis paratur*—Michaëlis: “nichts vom saft der weintrauben.”

Ver. 4. *From the stones to the rind*. מִן הַבָּצֵי וְעַד הַקֶּרֶךְ—Sep. ἀπο στεμφυλῶν εἰς γράστον—Vulg. *ab uva passa usque ad acinum*—Onk. מִפְּרִצָּן וְעַד עֲצוֹן; and so equivalently, but in an inverted order, the Thargums, Syr. and Saad.: but the Erpenian Arab. Pers. and Gr. Ven. seem best to have understood the text. Their versions are: מִן הַקֶּרֶךְ וְעַד הַבָּצֵי—ἀπο γράστου καὶ μέχρι ἐλντρου. These I have followed in my version. פְּרִצָּן denotes the minute parts, *granulos*, of the grape—וְעַד its *rind*, or *husk*, from its *pellucidity*. See the root נָגַד, through the various dialects.—Houbigant’s version is, *nec acinos nec ipsa vinacea*—Dathe’s: *na acinos quidem aut folliculos*—Michaëlis’s: “ja nicht einnahl den kern” oder die schale.”

Ver. 7. *The badge of his God*. בִּזְיוֹ אֱלֹהֵי. Sep. ἀρχὴ Θεοῦ αὐτῶν—Vulg. *consecratio Dei sui*—Onk. Tharg. Syr. Sam. ver. Pers. and Erp. have words that denote a *crown*, *corona*—Saadias: נֶסֶךְ, *abstinentia*—Gr. Ven. ἀφορισμα; which, perhaps, is of all the most proper rendering. It appears to mean *the long hair* of the Nazarite, which was a badge of his being consecrated to God. Hence Dathe thus renders the comma: *quoniam in capite gestat casariam*

* See Porphyry *De abstinentia*, l. iv. c. 7.

† In his *Programma posebale*, 1789, of which Michaëlis has given a neat abridgment in his *Oriental Library*, of the New Series, part vi. p. 235, &c.

Deo devotam. Houbigant: *quoniam in capite gestat Dei sui insignia.* Michaëlis paraphrases thus: weil er die Gotte durch sein gelübde geheiligten haare trägt."—If one wished to retain the very etymon of the Heb. term, he might render it by *Nazireate*, or *Nazarite-mark*.—For the rest, it was a common practice among almost all the nations of antiquity to let their hair grow long in honour of some divinity; which, after a certain time, being thorn, was burned as a sort of sacrifice; as the hair of the Nazarite is ordered to be offered here in ver. 18. See Spencer *De Leg. Heb.* lib. iii. dissert. i. c. 6.

Ver. 9. There is, in the Latin Vulgate, a grievous mistake in the rendering of a part of this verse. It makes the head of the Nazarite to be twice shaved: *quod radet illico die purgationis sue, et rursum die septimæ.*

C H A P. VII.

ON this chapter I have little to add to what has been said in Explanatory Notes. In ver. 3 interpreters are not agreed about the precise meaning of עֲלֹתָי. By Sep. they are rendered ἀμαξας λαμπηρικας; but by Aquila κατασκευαστας, followed by Jerom, *plaustra testia*, and by most modern translators: not without reason; for עֲלֹתָי, in Arabic, certainly signifies to *enclose*, *shut in*. Those waggons, then, were *close-covered* carts, perhaps somewhat like our provision-carts. There are critics, however, who think that אֲלֹתָי, not עֲלֹתָי, was the original reading; and this conjecture is favoured by the Sam. version, which has עֲלֹתָי מִלְחָמָה, *military waggons*; and by the Greek scholiast, who says that the Sam. copy had ἀμαξας δυνάμειος. Nay, Symmachus has also ὑπουργίας. All which induced Houbigant to render *plaustra ministerii*, *service-waggons*: a very plausible version; yet it is odd that not one ms. either Heb. or Sam. has now the lection אֲלֹתָי. I have therefore chosen to keep by the old version, with Dathe, Michaëlis, Hezel, &c.

Ver. 10. *Their bandsel-offerings.* אֶת חֲבֹתָי. Sep. τὰ ἐγκαινισμῶν; a most proper term, which in Latin might be called *initiale*. But I believe there is no term in any language that corresponds better with the Heb. than our *bandsel*. The "einweihungsoffer" of Michaëlis is likewise a very proper translation. We might say *initial-offering*.

Ver. 18. From this verse to verse 83 the text is much shortened in the Arabic version of Saadias, by the omission of all the verses which contain only a repetition of the things offered by the chiefs of the tribes, which are precisely the same. Dathe, in his Latin version, has followed the same method, with the following note: "Munera duodecim principum eadem fuerunt, et in textu Hebræo iisdem verbis describuntur. Ego vero nolui eadem toties repetere, neque vereor ne propterea reprehendar."—It would not, I fear, have so fared with me. If I had omitted those *repetitions*, howsoever useless, I should have incurred certain blame. But German liberality of sentiment is, yet, almost a stranger to England.

C H A P. VIII.

Ver. 7. *LET them shave their whole body.* So did the Egyptian priests, according to the testimony of Herodotus : 'Οι δὲ ἱερεῖς ξυρεῖνται πᾶν το σῶμα, διὰ τριτῆς ἡμέρας, ἵνα μὴτε φθεῖρ, μὴτε ἄλλαν μυστάρων μὴδεν, ἔγασται σφί θεραιπένουσι τοὺς Θεοὺς. Euterp. c. 37.

Ver. 9. *The whole assembly, &c.* In this and all such places, by the whole assembly, כָּל קָהָל, we are generally to understand the delegates or representatives of the people; their patriarchal chiefs, the sanhedrim.

C H A P. IX.

Ver. 1. *IN the first month of the second year.* This is an historical regression to a prior period; a thing not uncommon in the writer of the Pentateuch. What is here related must have happened before the muster mentioned in ch. 1.

C H A P. X.

Ver. 5. *AN alarm.* תִּקְוָה; from קָץ, Arab. قَطَعَ; to break. Hence Jerom has well rendered, *prolixior atque concisus* *. The Septuagint have σημασίαν: better the Greek of Venice, ἀλαλαγγον. Not badly Saad. נִפְתָּח סִלְכָּה. It is the Latin *taratantara*; which is little more than an imitation, or prolongation, of the Heb. word.

Ver. 9. *If when ye go to war ye blow an alarm with these trumpets, &c.* The sound of the trumpet has ever been considered as proper to excite courage in combatants.

Ære ciere viros, Martemque accendere cantu.

Ver. 29. *Hobab, the son of Reuel.* It is the remark of Archbishop Secker that our common translation here varies, having here *Raguel*, but in Exod. *Reuel*. This seems to me a sort of proof that Exodus and Numbers were translated by different persons. The translator of Numbers followed the Greek and Vulg.; that of Exodus the Masboretic punctuation. It is of little moment; only uniformity would be better. I cannot but here observe, that Moses's earnest request to Hobab to accompany the Israelites, on account of his *knowing how they should encamp in the wilderness*, and *be to them instead of eyes*, appears to be strange, if we are literally to believe what is related of the cloud in ch. 9. 17—23; and again in this same chap. 10, 11, 33, 34. If the cloud continually guided and directed their marches and encampments, what need was there of an Hobab to be *instead of eyes to them*? To me it appears, from this very passage, that Moses was conscious that Hobab knew the wilderness, and the

* So Virgil;—Martius ille ævis ranci canor increpat, et vox

Auditor fratris sonitus imitata tubarum.

Georg. iv. 71, 72.

places in it proper for encampments, better than himself or his cloud either *.—For the rest, a good guide was exceedingly necessary, and still is necessary, in traversing these deserts, particularly one who is well acquainted with the water-springs and the best pastures. Hobab, being a Midianite, and most probably a *Namade* or *Bedouine*, was a very proper person to be the conductor of the Israelites; “Hæc igitur loca, optimæque ac cuivis regione aptissimum castrametendi modum Chobabus ostendere, atque ita varia ac multiplici ratione Israelitis prospicere ac consulere poterat. Licet enim Israelitæ nunc duce uteretur, hæc tamen dumtaxat tractum situmque regionis, ad quam vel proficiscendum vel subsistendum erat, monstrabat; multa vero simul humana prudentiæ relicta erant.” Thus, cautiously and prudently, Rosenmüller!

Ver. 36. *Give repose, O Lord! to the myriads of Israel.* שְׁכַן יְהוָה אֶלֶף יִשְׂרָאֵל. The word שְׁכַן has, after Jerom, been generally rendered *return to*; the preposition אֶל, *to*, being understood before רַבְּבוֹת. But it is justly remarked by Houbigant that this is an awkward version; for, granting that an אֶל or לְ might be understood, which ought not readily to be granted, “non locum habere potest *reverti*, de Arca dictum [jam] *requiescente*, nec ab Israel nunquam discedente. Nos igitur, *converte, Domine, millia millium Israel.*” This version is evidently favoured by Sep.: ἐπιστρέψε, Κύριε, χίλιας χίλιας ἐν τῷ Ισραὴλ.—I consider שְׁכַן here as an active verb, in its third signification, corresponding with the Latin *quiesco*, in its active signification, and render *give repose to, fac-quiescere*.

C H A P. XI.

Ver. 1. *WHICH consumed a part of the camp.* וְהָאֵשׁ אָכְלָה חֵטְף מִן הַמַּחֲנֶה. In our common version these words are rendered, “and consumed *them that were* in the outermost parts of the camp:” on which Secker has the following just remark: “Sep. *consumed part of the camp* †;” rightly, for אָכְלָה is elsewhere followed by a ב; and חֵטְף doth not always signify an *extremity*, but *any part*, or *every part* ‡. Dele, therefore, *them that were in*.—To this I shall only add, that the Latin translator of the Sam. text has very properly rendered *et consumpsit partem castrorum*. Houbigant: *partem castrorum absumpsit*. I subjoin the sensible note of Rosenmüller: “Verbum חֵטְף hic notat *partem*, ut infra cap. 22. 41. et 23. 13. Coll. Arab. *ἄρ' τραχὺς, plaga*. Videtur autem fulmen dumeta et fruticeta, in illis desertis frequentia, incendisse; qui ignis non facile extinguendus, et cito huc illuc currens brevi multa tentoria consumere potuit, si enim fulmen aliquot duntaxat tentoria incendisset, vicina ab iis celes- riter amoveri, et ita flammâ cripi, potuissent.”

Ver. 4. *Yet again.* I am here of the opinion of those interpreters who consider יָשַׁב וַיִּבְכּוּ as a pure Hebraism denoting *repetition*. The Septuagint, however, took יָשַׁב in another sense: καθίσαντες κλάουσιν: and so Vulg. *sedens et flens*; which Houbigant follows, and defends against Le Clerc with his usual acuteness. But Dathe, elegantly, *denovo flere incipiebant*—Michaëlis: “fingen auch wieder an zu klagen.”

* See Toland's *Hodegus*, and a strange answer to it in Bibliotheca Biblica, vol. ii. p. 166.

† Kai καταφάγει μὲρος τι τῆς παρεμβολῆς.

‡ To the instances marked by the Archbishop, namely, Jerom. 51. 31. and Ezek. 33. 2. add Job, 21. 25. and Zachar. 11. 1. and 12. 6.

Ib. *Ob! that we had flesh to eat!* But how could they want flesh to eat, when they are said, in Exod. 12. 38. to have had *flocks and herds in great abundance?*—To solve this difficulty, some imagine that they were forbidden to kill their cattle, during their journey in the desert, except such as were to be sacrificed, grounding this opinion on what is said Levit. 17. 1—7; but I confess I see nothing in that passage that supports such an idea: it is there only forbidden to “slaughter, either in the camp or out of the camp, an ox, or a sheep, or a goat, “as an *holocaust*, or *eucharistic sacrifice*,” but there is no prohibition to kill them for common eating. Indeed, if there had been no other cattle slaughtered but such as were sacrificed at the convention-tent, their flocks and herds must have increased enormously; and many of them died a natural death in the course of forty years. I am inclined to think, then, that the word בשר, here rendered *flesh*, denotes only the *flesh* of *fish*, as it certainly does in Levit. 11. 11. And indeed the next verse seems to support this explication: “We remember “how freely we ate *fish*.” It was, then, particularly, the *flesh* of *fish* for which they longed, which was greatly more relishing than either the *beef* or *mutton* of those regions; which, unless when young, is dry and unpalatable. Of the great abundance and deliciousness of the fish of Egypt, all authors, ancient and modern, are agreed. The curious reader may consult, on that subject, Herodotus Euterp. c. 93. Diodor. Siculus, lib. 1. Strabo, l. 18. Athenæus, lib. vi. Sicard *Memoires des Missions*, tom. vi. p. 233. Pococke, part i. p. 300. and other later travellers. The lake of *Tenis*, or *Menzale*, which bordered on the land of Gothen, is at this day particularly abundant in fishes of various kinds. Bakoui says that they reckoned *seventy* sorts of fishes in it. Notices des mss. du Roi, vol. ii. p. 432.

Ver. 5. *Cucumbers.* קשאים. This is most probably the *cucumis chate*, or *queen of cucumbers*. “It grows,” says Hasselquist, p. 258, “in the fertile earth round Cairo, after the inundation of the Nile, and not in any other place in Egypt, nor in any other soil. It ripens with water-melons: its flesh is almost of the same substance, but is not nearly so cool. The grandees eat it as the most pleasant fruit they find, and that from which they have least “to apprehend. It is the most excellent of this tribe of any yet known.”

Ib. *Melons.* אבטחים. There is little doubt of this being the water-melon, as in Arabic it still retains the Heb. name בטח, *batech*. Hasselquist thus describes it, p. 355: “It is cultivated on the banks of the Nile, in the rich clayey earth, which subsides during the inundation, from the beginning of May until the overflowing of the Nile, i. e. to the end of July or beginning of August; and in the island Delta, especially at Burlos, whence the largest and best are brought. This serves the Egyptians for *meat*, *drink*, and *physic*. The flesh of it is eaten with bread: the juice is collected in a hole made in the melon, and is a most refreshing, but sometimes dangerous, drink: and the same juice, mixed with rose-water and a little sugar, is the only medicine used by the common people in burning fevers. This is very comfortable to the patient; for it cools and refreshes him.”

Ib. *Leeks.* רעיר. There is little or no doubt of this being the *leek*. See Celsus, part ii. p. 263. There is as little doubt of the next two words, בצלים and שומים, being *onions* and *garlic*.

Ver. 7. *Its colour was that of a pearl.* I have endeavoured to prove, in my Rem. on Gen. 2. 12. that בדרל signifies not the exudation called *bdellium*, but *the pearl*.

Ver. 8. *Its taste was like that of an oiled cake.* The present Heb. text has כֶּמֶעַם לֶשׁ זַיִת, which in our public version is rendered "as the taste of fresh oil *." I expected to find some variety of lection in the Sam. copy, or in some Sam. or Heb. ms.; but, No. Yet the ancient interpreters seem to have had before them a different reading; for thus they render: Sep. *ὡς γινώσκω ἐγκυμὸς ἐξ ἐλαίου*—Aq. *τοῦ μαζοῦ ἐλαίου* †—Vulg. *saporis quasi panis oleati*—Onk. כֶּמֶעַם דְּלִישׁ בְּמִשְׁחָא—Tharg. Bab. כֶּמֶעַם בִּימָה דְּמִסְבֵּלָא בְּשׁוּמָא—Tharg. Jeruf. כֶּמֶעַם בְּשִׁין כֶּרֶבֶשׁ—Syr. כֶּמֶעַם דְּלִישׁ בְּמִשְׁחָא—Sam. ver. כֶּמֶעַם לֶשׁ זַיִת—Saad. כֶּמֶעַם חֲמֵלָה בְּדִם. Erp. כֶּמֶעַם בְּחֵלָה בְּחֵלָה בְּחֵלָה—Perf. כֶּמֶעַם בְּחֵלָה בְּחֵלָה—Gr. Ven. *ὡς γαστὴς λιπυρὸς τοῦ ἐλαίου*.—It is evident that none of these versions (except the Samaritan) accord with the present textual reading. The word *לֶשׁ* occurs but twice in the Bible; here, and in Pl. 32. 4. where in our common translation it is rendered *moisture*. Nor derive we any aid from the sister dialects, unless perhaps from the Arabic, of which presently.

It is a wonder that Houbigant did not here exert his conjectural abilities. He contents himself with the present reading, and renders thus: *quarum sapor similis erat saporis spiritus oleo expressi*. But what is a *spirit* expressed from oil?—This is not more intelligible than the *viror* of Montanus.

It has been supposed that Sep. Syr. Onk. and Jerom. read in their copies, not *לֶשׁ*, but *לֵשׁ*, from the root *לֵשׁ*; and this supposition has a great degree of probability. Aquila, the Bab. Thargumist, and the Perfic translator, seem to have read *לֶשׁ*, or considered the *ל* as a mere prefix. But the Sam. translator certainly read as we do at present, as he retains the Heb. word. What then shall we say? that this reading is a corruption? or that *לֶשׁ* has a different meaning from that assigned to it in our lexicons?—Michaëlis suspected that the letters which compose the three Heb. words were originally these: *לֶשׁ דְּחֵשׁ מִן רֶבֶשׁ*, and should be thus divided: *לֶשׁ דְּחֵשׁ מִן רֶבֶשׁ*: which he renders *placenta mollis ex melle confecta*. The grounds of this conjecture are, 1st, because, in Exod. 16. 31. the manna is said to have a taste similar to that of *boneyed wafers*: 2d. because, here, the Jeruf. Tharg. and Arab. Erp. seem to have read *רֶבֶשׁ* instead of *לֶשׁ*. Rosenmüller thinks the present reading may be defended: "Tamen mihi lectio Masorethica sensum non ineptum dare videtur, si *לֶשׁ* interpreta-
"mur bucellas, *parvas placentas*; cujus significationis vestigium adhuc in Arab. deprehen-
"dere mihi videor: *לֶשׁ* enim significat *confecta ossa* . . . Igitur erunt *לֶשׁ דְּחֵשׁ מִן רֶבֶשׁ*, *bucelle in*
"oleo macerata."—However this be, I thought it best to follow the more ancient versions, and have, with Luther ‡, rendered *oiled cakes*.

Ver. 15. *That I may not see my misery.* Two of Kennicott's mss. instead of *my misery*, read *רַעְתָּם*, *their misery*: and the Jerusalem Tharg. has also the same reading, *רַעְתָּם*; and adds, by way of explanation, *רַעְתָּם*, *who are thine own people*. Nay, Jarhi assures us that this is the right reading. "Scribendum ei fuisset *רַעְתָּם*; sed utitur scriptura
"cognominatione; atque hæc una est ex correctionibus scribarum in lege, ad cognomentum
"et correctionem linguæ." The Masora tells us that there are eighteen such places. See Buxtorf's *Lex. Talmud.* p. 1054. or Eichhorn's *Einleitung*, vol. i. sect. 116.

* By Montanus, *sicut sapor viroris olei*.

† What was the version of Sym. is uncertain, as Scharfenberg has

shown in his excellent *Animadversiones*, p. 107.

‡ "Und es hatte einen geschmack wie ein oelkuche."—So

also Dauthe—"Sapore similis erat pani oleato"—and his precursor in elegance, Castilio—*sapore libi oleo confecti*.

Ver. 16. In my *Explan.* Note I have said that the seventy elders here mentioned were, probably, the same with those mentioned in *Exod.* 24. 1. But I cannot think, with some commentators, that they were the same with the judges and officers appointed in *Exod.* 18. 24. Le Clerc has almost demonstrated the contrary. See his *Dissertatio de Synedrio*, at the end of his *Comment.* on the Historical Books of the O. T. See also Michaëlis's *Mosaïsches Recht.* tom i. sect. 50.

Ver. 25. To what I have said in my *Explan.* Note, I cannot perhaps do better than abridge the *scholium* of Rosenmüller: "Cum dicitur *Jehovam se possuisse nuntibil ex spiritu Moses, et impertire id septuaginta ille senibus*, sine dubio nihil aliud significatur, quam hoc: singulari Dei providentia factum esse, ut 70 illi viri, Moysi adhortatione permoti, subito animum seditiosum mutassent, ad Mosem transiissent, eumque adjuvassent. . . . Subita illa animi mutatio, in lingua antiqua et egena, ab hominibus exulta qui nihil fere nisi corporea cogitare solent, non facile aliter exprimi potuisse videtur, quam per metaphoricam locutionem quæ hoc loco legitur *וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֵלֶיךָ כְּמֹהֵם* ad verbum *Et factum est, cum quiescisset super hos hic spiritus*, i. e. *tali animo affecti*. . . . Plerique interpretes *וַיִּזְכְּרוּ* vertunt *et vaticinati sunt*. At in tota hac historia nihil de prædictione rerum futurarum occurrit. . . . igitur illa interpretatio contextui plane non est apta *. . . . Hoc loco, ubi sermo est de subita animi mutatione in 70 senibus, verbum *וַיִּזְכְּרוּ* indicare videtur, viros illos præter omnem expectationem seditionis sedandæ causa populum hortatos esse, ut officii erga Deum et Mosem memor esset: quæ interpretatio præcipuè confirmatur per id quod ver. 29. legitur; ubi Moyses, cum Jôshua ei nuntias, eos etiam viros, ex 70 senibus, qui in castris remansissent, *προφητεύον*, in hæc verba erumpit: *Num mea causa irrides? Utinam totus populus ita loqueretur ut viri illi: ex quibus verbis satis clare intelligi potest, viros illos populum seditiosum ad meliora hortatos esse.*"

Ver. 26. I have disjoined from ver. 25 two words which are different in the Heb. and Sam. copies. In the former they are written thus: *וְלֹא יָסַח*: and commonly rendered either "and did not cease †," [to prophesy,] as in our public version, or "and did not add ‡," as they are rendered by Ainsworth and Purver; neither of which renderings is to me intelligible.—The reading of Sam. is *וְלֹא יִסְבּוּ*, which in the Latin version Pol. is badly rendered *et: sed non ultra addiderunt §*, although the Sam. ver. *וְלֹא יִסְבּוּ* pointed out the true translation, *Et non congregati sunt*. By adopting this reading, with Houbigant, Dathe, and Rosenmüller, and placing *וְלֹא יָסַח* at the head of ver. 26, the text will be rectified, and the sense clear: *At non congregati sunt, sed remanserant in castris viri duo, quorum nomen unius Eldad et nomen alterius Medad, tamen requievit super eos spiritus ille (nam ipsi ex conscriptis, etsi non egressi erant ad tentorium) et prophetabant in castris.*—The words in parenthesis I have in my version removed from their place, to make the meaning still clearer, and the phrasing more agreeable to the English idiom.

Ver. 31. *At the height of about two cubits above the ground.* *כַּמֶּטֶם עַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ*; com-

* I have, however, retained the word *prophesy* in my version; because it has in our language obtained a meaning of greater latitude than the Latin *vaticinor*. † With Vulg. *non ultra cessaverunt*. ‡ So Sep. *et non erant propheetae*. The former considered *קָם* as the *radix*; the latter, *קָם*.

§ In the idea, probably, that the *et* in *וְלֹא* was an interpolation; but it is more probable that an *et* has been dropped out of the Heb. copies.

monly rendered, as in our public version: "as it were two cubits *high* upon the face of the "earth." A wonderful fall of locusts this! But how could the people gather them? The Thargums tell us that "they waded through them up to the navel, and yet were not fatigued!" But the Hebrew words import no such absurd meaning; and are well rendered by Jerom: *volabantque in aere, duobus cubitis altitudine super terram*. They flew so nigh the ground, that they were easily caught;* which is still the case, when quails after a long aerial voyage are exhausted with fatigue. The device of Rosenmüller and some others to save the common rendering is this: "Puto potius verbis Hebræis indicari, bicubitales acervos hinc illinc fuisse "disperfos, ut vacua subinde spatia remanserint, per quæ populus collecturus ire potuerit."— This certainly saves them from *wading up to the navel*: but I fear it would not have saved them from the plague. The putrefaction of bicubital heaps of quails, *to the distance of a day's journey round the camp*, would certainly have been no pleasant neighbourhood.

Ver. 32. *Spread them out to dry.* מִשְׁחֵם מִשְׁחֵם. But the Sam. copy has מִשְׁחֵם מִשְׁחֵם; or, as 4 mss. מִשְׁחֵם מִשְׁחֵם, *multaverunt multatione*. The transposition of a letter makes all the difference; and this has not unfrequently happened, in transcribing the text. Even here one of Kennicott's mss. had at first מִשְׁחֵם. All the antient versions, however, are against the Samaritan lection.

Ver. 33. *The Lord smote the people with a great mortality.* מָוֹת רַבָּה בָּעָם יִשְׂרָאֵל. "Hac locutione (says Rosenmüller) sæpe alias *repetita mors multorum hominum* indicatur; "veluti supra vers. 1. hujus capitis. Hinc totus hic versus nil aliud continebit quam hoc: Inter "ipsam coturnicium epulationem multos homines esse sublatos; id quod præci homines poenam "murmurationis contra Deum existimârunt. Causa vero subitæ illius mortis, sine dubio, naturalis erat: scilicet, jam veteres observârunt coturnices elleboro et aliis herbis venenatis vesci "solere; qua de re multa collegit Bochartus†. Talibus coturnicibus qui vescébantur Israelitæ "esû carniū harum insalubrium perierunt."

The sum of the story seems to be, That the people had become seditious and clamorous for food. Moses, to appease them, selects seventy of their chiefs, and reasons with them upon the pernicious tendency of such a conduct: these seize his own spirit, and prophecy; that is, control by their persuasive enthusiasm the propensity of the riotous multitude. Meanwhile a flight of quails comes opportunely to gratify their desires: these they eat voraciously, and fall victims to their own intemperance. All the rest is, in my conception, oriental imagery and poetical exaggeration.

Ver. 34. *Kibroth-kathava*. Niebuhr seems to think that this may be the present *Gabel-el-mokateb*; where he found sepulchral inscriptions, in Egyptian hieroglyphics, of exquisite beauty. If there could be any proof adduced, that those inscriptions were the work of the Israelites, it would lead to many curious conclusions; among others, that Moses may have written his Laws in Egyptian characters, which were afterwards transposed into Syrian letters.

* Josephus understood the text in the same manner. His words are: Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον, ὀρνυγὰν πλῆθος (τρεφεὶ δὲ ταῦτο τὸ ὄρνειον, ὡς οὐδὲν ἕτερον, ὁ Ἀραβικὸς κόλπος) ἐπιπτάται τὴν μεταξὺ θαλάσσαν ὑπερῶν, καὶ ὑπὸ κομποῦ τὰ ἅμα τῆς πτῆσεως, καὶ προσγίονται μᾶλλον τῶν ἀλλῶν ὄν, καταφερεται εἰς τοὺς Ἑβραίους. Ὅτι δὲ συλλαμβανάντες, ὡς τρεφὴν αὐτοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ταύτην μηχανησάμενον, τὴν ἐνδοξάν κωττο. Antiq. l. i. c. 1. n. 5. p. 120.

† Hieroz. pars ii. p. 97.

C H A P. XII.

Ver. 1. *ON account of his marrying a Chushite woman.* This woman is generally supposed to be Ziphora: but Ziphora was not a Chushite; she was a Midianite. Who then was the Chushite woman, on whose account "Mary and Aaron spoke against Moses?"—Some think it was *Tharbis*, the daughter of the king of *Chush*, or *Æthiopia*, whom Moses is said to have married before his flight from Egypt. See the note on Exod. 2. 11. p. 162. But, if ever such a marriage took place, Tharbis must have died, or been abandoned by Moses, long before this period. Onkelos and the other Thargumists give a very different turn to the passage. According to them, Mary and Aaron reproached Moses, not for *marrying* a Chushite woman, but for *repudiating* his beautiful wife, Ziphora; who is here called a *Chushite*, *per antiphrasin*, from her being the very contrast of a Chushite; as, in Latin, *lucus a non lucendo*!—But whence infer they that she was beautiful, nay, the very pink of beauty, if we believe the Jerusalem Thargum? Why, whence but from the same word *Chushite*, *כושית*, the letters of which make up the number 736? and so exactly do the letters of the *יפה בראה*, *beautiful to behold*! Reader! I give thee this as a curious sample of Rabbinical commentatorship: if thou be not satisfied, I cannot help it*.—But, still, who was the *Chushite* woman whom Moses had married, and for which marriage he was reproached by his own sister and his own brother?—Bochart has laboured to prove that the *Chushites* and *Midianites* were the same people; and consequently that Ziphora may here be designated. But his arguments are certainly not conclusive; and his hypothesis is barely probable: not to say, with Rosenmüller, manifestly false. Indeed, it is highly improbable that Ziphora could here be the cause of reproach, after being married to Moses above forty years. I am inclined, then, to think, with Michaëlis, that the Chushite woman here mentioned was a second wife, whom Moses, about this time, took to his bed, perhaps after the death of Ziphora: but this second wife was not an African Chushite, but an Arabian Chushite: and therefore the word ought not to be rendered *Æthiopian*; although that be the rendering of Sep. Vulg. and Gr. Ven.—The Oriental versions retain the Hebrew term *Chushite*.

Ver. 3. *Now Moses was the mildest of all men, &c.* Who can believe that this was written by Moses himself? It is, evidently, an interpolation, in the supposition that the rest of the narrative was written by Moses; but comes in naturally enough, if the writer was a different person; which indeed is my belief. See however Eichhorn's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, tome ii. sect. 440. p. 377. of the second edition †.

* To make the comment more complete, I will just add Jarhi's objectional query, and R. Nathan's answer. "But how did Mary know, that Moses had separated himself from his wife?—Rabbi Nathan says: Mary was with Ziphora at the time when word was brought to Moses that Eldad and Medad were prophesying in the camp: which when Ziphora heard, she exclaimed: Wo to the wives of those men! who, if they once addict themselves to prophesy, will separate themselves from their wives, as my husband has separated himself from me. Thus Mary discovered the secret, which she imparted to Aaron."—*Prophecy*, it seems, and the *conjugal duty* are incompatible things. A good monkish idea!

† I have taken no notice of Kennicott's version, borrowed from Schultens's *Sylloge Dissertationum*, because I deem it indefensible. It is: "Now the man Moses gave forth more answers than, or was highly favoured with answers above, all the men who were upon the face of the earth." How this version "answers the argument of Spinosa," I cannot perceive; for it is as unlikely that Moses would have written after this manner, as after the other. See Kennicott's *Remarks*, p. 57.

Ver.

Ver. 6, 7, 8. There is nothing obscure in the grammatical construction of these three verses: but the language is highly figurative. I cannot do better than transcribe Rosenmüller's annotation: "*Cum Deus, in toto hoc sermone, non Dei ipsam naturam sed ejus voluntatem significet, videre imaginem, figuram, Jehovah dicitur is, qui ejus voluntatem ex emblemate quodam conjicit; non ipsam prolatam a Deo intelligit. Omnia autem tribus istis versibus dicta huc redeunt: Mosem Deo familiarissimum esse; hinc injuriam amico Dei illatam, ab eo non imputam relictam.*"

Ver. 13. *Nay, I beseech thee.* The present text has נָא לְנָא, *God! I beseech thee*; and in this sense לְנָא was taken by all the antient translators from Sep. to Gr. Ven. So our common version, and indeed almost all modern versions. Yet I am of opinion, with Michaëlis, that we should point נָא לְנָא, as in ver 11. and render as I have done. I doubt very much if נָא לְנָא be a Hebraism: at least, I recollect not any other example. If Moses had meant to express himself in that manner, he would have probably used בִּי אֲדוני or נָא יְהוָה. Michaëlis's version is: "*Onein! mache sie wieder gesund.*"

Ver. 14. *After which, she shall recover.* וְאַחֲרָיו תִּשְׁכַּח, which in our common version is rendered: "*and after that let her be received in again.*"—More briefly Sep. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐνέλευσεν αὐτή. To the same purport Vulg. *et postea revocabitur.* And so equivalently all the ant. versions, including Gr. Ven.—But I cannot see, that the verb שָׁכַח ever signifies *to return*: whereas it certainly signifies, *to recover from an illness*; and particularly from a leprosy. See 2 Kings 5. 3, 6, 7. The radical meaning of the word is, *to gather*; and, in a metaphorical sense, *to recover*: as we vulgarly say of a recovering person, *he gathers up, he picks up*; and I remember to have heard the phrase, *She is gathering up herself*; which corresponds exactly with the שָׁכַח of this verse, and the שָׁכַח, or rather שָׁכַח* of the next.

C H A P. XIII.

Ver. 1. I HAVE often wondered at the obstinacy, with which the integrity of the Masoretic Hebrew text, and its superiority to the Sam. Exemplar, have been defended. The words which are here wanting in the former, but expressed in the latter, are said in Deut. 1. 20. to have been actually spoken by Moses to the Israelites on this occasion: and their omission in the Hebrew text is a manifest deficiency. The omission, however, must have been an early one, and prior to the Septuagint version; if the Septuagint version have not been here remodelled according to the Hebrew: which I greatly suspect.

Ver. 3. al. 4. *At the command of the Lord.* עַל פִּי יְהוָה. Sep. διὰ φωνῆς Κυρίου—Vulg. *quod Dominus imperaverat*: and so equivalently all the versions. Most literally Gr. Ven. ἐκ στόματος τοῦ κυρίου.—Delgado would render, "*by the Lord's permission,*" to solve what he calls a glaring contradiction between this place and Deut. 1. 22. But, in the Sam. copy there is no contradiction: and עַל פִּי, I think, never signifies *by permission*.

Ver. 19. al. 20. *In open or in walled cities.* The present Hebrew text has בְּמִנְצִיחִים אִם בְּמִנְצִירִים, which in our common version is rendered: "*whether in tents, or in strong holds:*" by Montanus: *num in castris, an in munitionibus.* But the question is not here of *camps* or

* Which is the Samaritan reading.

*tents**; but, of what sort were the towns; whether *weak* or *strong*, *open* or *walled*? I therefore, with Houbigant, prefer the Sam. reading *וּמְחֻנִּים אֵין מְבָצֵרִים*, without the preposition *ב*, although I have, with most of the ant. versions, expressed it in my translation. Sep. and Vulg. seem to have read the two terms inversely; as the former has *αἱ ἐν τειχεύμασιν ἢ ἐν ἀτειχεύστοις*; the latter, *mutatæ an absque muris*. But neither these nor any other of the ant. translators† appear to have read *מַחֲנִים*, *camps*, in their copies; except Gr. Ven. which has *ἐν στρατοπέδοις*. See Castell on the root *חָבַן*, and Houbigant's excellent note on the place.

Ver. 21. *Unto Rebob*. I have said in Explan. Notes, that *Rebob*, *רֶבּוֹב*, might be rendered appellatively; and so it is in Tharg. *עַד מְלִישִׁתָּא מַעֲלָךְ לְאַמְשׁוּכָא* ‡; where mark, that this Thargumist took *Hamath* to be the same with *Antioch*. But Josephus, with more probability, makes it *Epiphania*.

Ver. 22. al. 23. *And coming to Hebron*. I have here only to remark, that there is a gross solecism in the present Hebrew text; *יָבֵא* for *יָבִיא*, which last is the Sam. lection, and was the first reading of one of Kennicott's and one of De Rossi's mss. It was also read by all the antient translators, save Onkelos and Gr. Ven. and is followed by Houbigant, Kennicott, Michaëlis, Dathe, Rosenmüller, Hezel. Even our English versions here abandon the Hebrew, and render in the plural. Lilienthal, I believe, is the only modern who has ventured to defend the singular reading. Singular is his manner of defending it. "It is probable (says he) that the spies went not conjunctly, but severally, to reconnoitre the different provinces. One, then, only, Caleb, went to explore Hebron. The enallage *יָבֵא* for *venit quisque*, 'one went,' is common."—No, never in such a construction as this. He seems to have borrowed his idea from Jarhi; but durst not pursue the Rabbi through his whole interpretation, which is highly ridiculous §.

Ib. *The race of Anak*. *לִידֵי הָעֵקֶן*. I have not, with our English translators, rendered, "the children of Anak;" that the reader might not imagine that Ahiman, Shephai and Thalmai were the immediate sons of Anak. The Septuagint have, as usual, very properly rendered, *γενεῶν Ἐνωχ*, or, as Alex. Glasg. and some other mss. better, *Ἐνωχ*, with a *kappa*.—But who was *Enak*, or *Anak*? and what sort of *race* were his *progeny*? Onk. Syr. Tharg. both Arabs, render appellatively, *the progeny of the GIANT*||. To this they were moved, no doubt, by the præfix *ה*; which is not usually placed before proper names. The same reason induced Michaëlis to seek for an appellative meaning, which he finds in the Arabic *قعر*, *intravit latibulum*; whence *עֵקֶן*, *a mouse-hole*. The *Anakites*, then, were people who lived in *holes*, or caves: and *לִידֵי עֵקֶן* are *the sons of the cave*: i. e. *Troglodytes*.—But, besides that the *Troglodytes*

* This is allowed even by Jarhi; who says, that *מְחֻנִּים*, according to the Thargum, is here for *מְבָצֵרִים*, which denotes open cities without walls.

† The comma is wanting in Syr.

‡ So also Gr. Ven. *αχρη πλατυνας, ὡς*

αφικνωτο *εἰς Ἀμαθην*. The other translators retain the Hebrew word: and, indeed, we find *Rebob* among the cities of the tribe of *Asser*. Josh. 19. 28. It was probably the northmost town of that tribe, and might be called *Rebob* from the lane that led thence to *Hamath*.

§ "Et venit usque ad Hebron. Caleb solus ed ivit, ac se prostravit super sepulcra Patriarcharum, (orans) ne ipse a sociis suis seduceretur, ut eorum consilium sequeretur; hinc illa (Scriptura) 'dicit: atque ei dabo terram quam calcavit.'" But a more sober Jewish critic than Jarhi (Norzius) acknowledges that *יָבֵא* is here to be taken plurally. De Rossi *Var. Leß.* and *Appendix*. || Vulg. Perf. and Gr. Ven. retain the Hebrew name.

dytes are elsewhere called *Horites*, not *Anakites*, Michaëlis's etymon appears to me to be constrained. I would rather derive the word from its Hebrew root *קנן*, and give it the meaning of one who *binds*, that is, *subjects* other people by violence. If then I were to translate appellatively, I should be inclined to say *sons of the chain*; or, to vernaculize the very Hebrew word, *sons of the HANK*; which, in Islandic and Scottish, signifies a *chain, fetter, bond*. And we still say, to have a *bank on one*. "Quasi dicas: *ita vinculis obstrictum aliquem habere, ut præ metu ad omnia, quæ volueris, præsto sit.*" Lee.—Or, if an Arabic etymon be sought, would not the idea of *pride* and *pre-eminence* be preferable? For *קנן* is found to have all the following significations: *intumuit, emimuit, prominuit*; *mons excelsus, collis monti supereminens, &c.* And this etymon was probably in the view of those interpreters, who have rendered *קנן* *Gigantis*, or *Gigantum*.—It is in favour, however, of Michaëlis's hypothesis, that there were certainly *caves*, and large caves, about Hebron, where the race of *Anakites* are said to have resided: and I find that Dathe, Hezel, Schulz and Rosenmüller have adopted Michaëlis's version; which is, "die in unterirdischen höhlen wohnen *."

Ver. 23. al. 24. *When they came to the vale of Eschol.* They so named the place from the cluster of grapes, which they brought thence. *עשכול* means a *cluster*, and the comma is so rendered by Sep. *ἐως παραπλῆγος βοτρυς*—and by Jerom, *ad torrentem botri* †. Most copies of Sep. have here the following addition: *καὶ κατισκεψαντο αὐτὴν*: but this is wanting in Compl. and in Serravius's ms. it is marked with an *obelos*. This, however, is no proof that it was not in the original Septuagint. We shall be able to say something more on the subject, when we have seen Dr. Holmes's edition.—For the rest, the size of the grapes in Palestine and Syria is known to be enormous. Bunches have been met with, of from *ten to twelve* pounds weight; and F. Ignatius à Rheinfelden, in 1656, saw a cluster of an *ell* in length. A single grape is sometimes half a *nail* long. I have seen them grow, in our own climate, to a very uncommon size.

Ver. 29. al. 30. *The Chanaanites dwell by the sea, &c.* The sea here mentioned is generally supposed to be the Mediterranean; and these Chanaanites are thought to be so called *נַחַר' עֶצְרָה*; or, the *Chanaanites proper*. But I am more inclined to think that the *Dead sea* is here referred to, especially as "and along the Jordan" is added.—The Philistines, who were not of the Chanaanite race, inhabited the coast of the Mediterranean.

Ver. 30. al. 31. *Here a murmur arising among the people, &c.* The text is here very laconic, and perhaps defective. *וַיִּחַם כָּל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־מֹשֶׁה*: by Montanus rendered, *Et fecit tacere Caleb populum ad Moſeb*; by our English translators: "And Caleb stilled the people before Moses."—Similarly Sep. *Καὶ κατισυναπήγει Χαλὲς τὸν λαὸν πρὸς Μωϋσιν*.—The Thargum paraphrases thus: *But Chaleb silenced the people, and made them listen to Moses*: and Jerom thus: *Inter hæc Caleb compescens murmur populi, qui oriebatur contra Moysen, &c.* "acting the interpreter," says Houbigant, "being unable to act the translator." But, with Houbigant's good leave, Jerom acted the genuine translator, by supplying what is certainly understood, although not express in the original. Nor is there any *solecism* in Jerom's version, as Houbigant too rashly affirms. The antecedent to *qui* is not *murmur*, but *populi*.—Drusius and Le Clerc

* The *Zaan* mentioned in this verse is the *Tanis*; as it is here rendered by Sep. and Vulg. It was then the capital of Egypt. † The word *torrents* is here improper, as in some other places in the Vulgate.

thought something had been dropt out of the text, and imagined that the gigantic *fameeb* in the word פִּת was a mark of some deficiency. But this is a mere Buxtorfian fancy. All the antients seem to have read as we do at present: yet, when we compare this passage with Deut. i. 26. we must allow that Jerom has well supplied the want: and I have accordingly imitated him; only putting my supplement in Italics.—So, elegantly, Dathc: “*Orto ad hac fremitu populi, Caleb mitigare animos in Mosem studuit.*”—Houbigant’s version is: “Tum Caleb, presente Mose, silentium populo imperans,” &c. He would read פִּת for פִּת . One of Kennicott’s mss. has פִּת .

Ib. *Said † to them*]. The words *to them* are only in Sam. and Sep. וְאֵלָיו , *autw*. The latter, moreover, adds *אֵלָיו*, *ay*: which, perhaps, is but a different rendering of וְאֵלָיו , or וְאֵלָיו .

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 13, 14. THE text is here not a little perplexed and obscure; and, perhaps, in some measure corrupted. Yet there is no important variety of lection in either the Heb. or Sam. copies. As the whole passage is literally rendered by our translators, I shall first give it in their words: “And Moses said unto the Lord, Then the Egyptians shall hear *it* (for thou broughtest up this people in thy might from among them); and they will tell *it* to the inhabitants of this land: *for* they have heard that thou, Lord, *art* among this people; that thou, Lord, art seen face to face; and *that* thy cloud standeth over them; and *that* thou goest before them, by day in a pillar of a cloud, and in a pillar of fire by night.” This is, certainly, not very intelligible, nor well expressed: yet it is similar to most of the ant. versions. That of Jerom, indeed, is somewhat clearer: “Ut audiant Ægyptii, de quorum medio eduxisti populum istum, et habitatores terræ hujus, qui audierunt, quod tu, Domine, in populo isto sis, et facie videaris ad faciem, et nubes tua protegat illos, et in columna nubis præcedas eos per diem, et in columna ignis per noctem: quod occideris,” &c.—Let us now see how the Septuagint have handled the matter: *Και ακουσεται Αιγυπτιος, οτι απηγογες τη ισχυι σου τον λαον τωτον εξ αυτων· αλλα και παντες οι κατοικωντες επι της γης ταυτης, οτι συ εις καρμος εν τη λαω τατη, θεις οφθαλμοις και οφθαλμους σπταιζει, Κυριε, και η νεφουλη σου εφεισηκεν επ’ αυτων, και εν σιλω νεφελης συ παρευη πρωτερος αυτων την ημεραν, και εν σιλω πυρος την νυκτα· και εκτρανεις, κ. τ. λ.*—By this version Houbigant thinks the whole difficulty removed. Instead of וְאֵלָיו וְאֵלָיו , he fancies, they must have read in their copy וְאֵלָיו וְאֵלָיו , as they render *αλλα και παντες κατοικωντες* *et vero omnes incolæ*: and agreeably to this emendation he forms his own version: “Audient hoc Ægyptii, postquam tu tuâ virtute populum istum de medio eorum eduxisti: Sed et omnes terræ illius habitatores audiverunt,” &c.—To enforce this rendering, and that reading, he remarks that וְאֵלָיו was easily changed into וְאֵלָיו ; and that וְאֵלָיו and וְאֵלָיו are composed of the same letters, save *one*: namely, that ו has been changed into ו ; as might readily be done. This last is acknowledged; from the great similarity there is between them in mss. where the top of ו is often so short as hardly to be perceived: but such a transposition, as altogether appears in the whole word, is certainly not very common, if not unprecedented. Nor is it certain that the Septuagint followed this reading. Their *αλλα και* may be equivalent to the præfix *vau* only: although, indeed, they seem to have read וְאֵלָיו for וְאֵלָיו : and if I found that

reading in any Heb. or Samaritan mss. I should be inclined to adopt it. But, as all the mss. and all the other ant. translators must have read מל in their copies; I would rather try to make a meaning out of the text such as it is, than to amend it by conjectural criticism. I think, then, that the præfix before שמעו in ver. 13. should be rendered *when*, and not *then*. I would next render כי before וקלית by *although*, a meaning which it frequently has; and then include in a parenthesis all the words from שמעו in ver. 14. to לילה inclusively, as I have done in my version. The word אמרו, *they will say*, in ver. 15. is a mere resumption, common in all languages; and particularly in our own. I need not tell my learned readers, that the word כי, or אשר, is to be understood before שמעו in ver. 14. This is the most I could make of my original: yet I confess that the reading כל, instead of מל, before ושמע, without the other alterations proposed by Houbigant, has a great degree of speciousness; beside the authority of Sep.

Ver. 21. *As sure as I live, and as my glory filleth the whole earth.* וד אני' ויסלח כבוד ירחם את: by our translators thus rendered: "*As I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the LORD.*" But this, I think, cannot be the meaning of the original—although it was so understood by all the antients; save Saadiah, who has admirably well rendered: *הלכן ובקאי אלרחים ודאי אלדי יסלח נסיע אלרחי. By my perpetual permanency, and my splendor which filleth the whole earth.* The last comma is evidently a part of the oath; and is so understood by Jarhi, and Vatable, whose version is, *Quam certum est me vivere, et gloriam meam implere terram**, &c.—Not badly Purver: "Yet surely by my living, and the whole earth being filled with the glory of the Lord." And, more recently, Delgado: "However, as I live, and as the whole earth is filled with the glory of the Lord."—I have no doubt of this being the meaning: and I wonder how it escaped the penetration of Michaëlis, Dathe, and Hezel.

Ver. 25. The first part of this verse seems awkwardly placed; which induced the Syriac translator to make it a continuation of ver. 24, as if the territory of the *Amalekites and Canaanites who inhabited the valley*, were to be a part of the possession of Chaleb. But, by comparing this comma with ver. 43, we must consider it as a parenthesis, abrupt indeed and unconnected in the original, but made somewhat less so, I flatter myself, in my version.

Ver. 27. *How long will this perverse people continue their murmurings against me?* In the original there is only עד כתי לעדה ורעה הואת' אשר דמה מלינים עלי; by Montanus most literally rendered: *Usquequo ad certum malum istum, qui ipsi murmurantes super me?* Nor much less literal Sep. עד כתי לעדה ורעה הואת' אשר דמה מלינים עלי; וד כתי לעדה ורעה הואת' אשר דמה מלינים עלי. Vulg. *Usquequo multitudo hæc pessima murmurat contra me?*—So equivalently Onk. and Syr.—Others have otherwise filled up the *ellipsis*; as by the words *patiar, condonabo*: and Houbigant imagines that the original text was עד כתי אשר, *Quousque ego patiar.* So our common English version: "How long shall I bear with this evil congregation?" The *lamed* before עד is supposed to favour this supplement.—I believe, nothing is wanting in the text, which offers an elegant *ellipsis*: nor is it necessary to supply אשר: nor can אשר here, in my opinion, be rightly rendered either *which* or *who*; but *that*, considered as a conjunction. "How long will it be customary to this perverse people, *that* they will murmur," &c.—The Vulgate, then, has well expressed

* To the same purport Diodati: "Ma pure come Io vivo e come tutta la terra è ripiena della mia gloria." And before him Bruciolli: "Quanto è cosa certa, ch' io vivo, e che la mia gloria riempie tutta la terra, tanto è certo," &c. Both these translations are elegant, and just.

the meaning; followed by Michaëlis: "Wie lange will diese böse gemeine mit mir unzufrieden seyn?"—And before him Luther: "Wie lange murret diese böse gemeine wider mich?" retained by Hæzel.—But Le Clerc and Dathe, *Quousque condonabo*, &c.—Rosenmüller adopts Houbigant's translation.

Ver. 31. *Your children, &c.* I have followed the Syriac translator, who had before him the text as follows: *אל דעו דחם טוב ורע' חמה יבא אל*: corresponding almost with the P. P. Deut. i. 39. and partly corroborated by Sep. although their text seems in some measure mutilated, and varies in the different copies. For the rest, the final mark (|) of the various reading, in my version, is misplaced: it should be after "land|."

Ver. 34. *And shall experience my aversion.* *וידעתם את תבואתי*: by Sep. rendered *καὶ γνώσεσθε τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ κυρίου*—Vulg. *et scietis ultionem meam*; followed by our first English translators; but rejected in the Bishops' Bible, and posterior versions; which substitute: "and ye shall know my breach of promise*;" on which Kennicott makes the following remark: "'Tis no wonder that such an expression, when spoken of God, should be objected to by the Deists. In answer to *Christianity as old as the Creation*, Dr. Waterland has these excellent observations: '*My breach of promise* is a harsh translation, and merely conjectural, not warranted by the Hebrew original. Some of our elder translations had a better rendering: 'Ye shall feel my vengeance:' or, 'Ye shall know my displeasure.'"—Yet, harsh† as the other common version seems to be, it has been speciously defended. *Breach of promise*, it has been said, here means no more than a *revocation*, or *cassation*, of God's former covenant, which was conditional. "*Cassatio mea est cassatio foederis mei vobiscum, et promissionum mearum, quæ conditionales fuere.*" So Malvenda; and this idea pleased Houbigant: "*videbitisque ut fœdus ego vobiscum meum fregerim.*"—It is not, however, easy to perceive, how such a meaning can be drawn from *תבואתי*.—Onk. Syr. and Targ. understood it as referring not to God, but to the murmurs of the Israelites against him, and some moderns have adopted that meaning.—Le Clerc defends the Vulg. version with plausibility: and I find that the late Bishop Law was of the same opinion. His version is: "and ye shall feel my resentment."—I rather think that the primitive meaning of *נחם* or *נח* is *amare*, *abnuere*: and Gr. Ven. thus renders the comma in question: *αγαπᾷτε τὸν κύριον ἀντιμισθίαν μου*.

Ver. 37. *Were struck dead, before the Lord.* "*Videntur seditiosi illi homines, Moïsi jussu, illo in loco interfecti esse.*" Rosenmüller.

Ver. 40. Instead of *והעלינו* in the last member of this verse, I suspect that we should read *והעלינו*, *lead us up*: but all the versions favour the present reading.

Ver. 44. *They presumptuously insisted.* So I render the word *יטעלו*. Jerom seems to have read *יטעלו*, which he renders *contumaciter*—But Sep. *ἀπαρνησάμενοι*—Still better Gr. Ven. *ἐμπεσόντες*.—Our common version has *presumed*, not badly: yet I think the word implies somewhat more than simple presumption.—Some moderns give another turn to the phrase; and render

* Adopted by Bate, nor corrected by Delgado. Purver has, "and know a rupture with me." † The old Geneva French version is still harsher: "Afin que vous cognoissiez mon manquement:" but by the last Revisers changed into this paraphrase: "Et vous connoîtrez, que j'ai interrompu le cours de mes bénédictions sur vous."—Le Cene: "Et vous éprouverez ce que c'est que de rompre avec moi."

they made no account of what Moses said; *parvi fecerunt*. So Michaëlis and Rosenmüller. But Dathe agrees with me: "Illi vero pertinaciter contenderunt montem ascendere."

Ver. 45. *So they returned to the camp*. This addition, which is in Sam. and Sep. is called a *gloss*, by most modern interpreters, for the honour of the Hebrew text: I beg leave to differ from them, and believe it to be a genuine portion of the original.

C H A P. XV.

Ver. 38. *FRINGES*. מצצ. Sep. *κραιπνά*—Vulg. *frimbrias*—Onk. *פרימריס*, the Greek word chaldaized—and so equivalently the other versions. Yet, perhaps, the word means rather a *flower-knot*, or *tassel*. In Isa. 28. 4. מצצ is evidently a *flower*; and in Ezek. 8. 3. it is a *lock* or *curl*.—The *blue* or *azure* ribband added to those *fringes*, or *flowers*, being of the same colour with the high-priest's tunic, might be a continual admonition to the Israelites, that the whole nation was a *priestly kingdom*, and a *nation hallowed* to the Lord. See Exod. 19. 6. This is the observation of Le Clerc.

C H A P. XVI.

Ver. 1. *THERE* is a singular ellipsis in this verse, according to the present reading and Masoretic punctuation. The verb *קח* has no objective! "And Korah took"—what? "Men," according to our common version, and most other modern versions: but this is an arbitrary supplement, which has no parallel in the Hebrew Scriptures. Onkelos, Syr. Sam. vers. Arab. Erp. and Perf. seem to have taken *קח* in a reflexive sense: *he took himself off*: i. e. *he dissented*; or, as some of our English versions, *he went apart*. But this is an inadmissible interpretation, although much prized by the Rabbins.—The Bab. Tharg. says that it was a *blue tunic*, which Korah assumed—no doubt to rival Aaron: but this is another Rabbinical conceit.—The Jerus. Tharg. supplies the word *קח*, *he took counsel*; no inept supplement, if it were authorized by examples.—Some, perhaps, may think that the Septuagint had some such notion in view; as they render *קח* *ελαλῆσε*.—Jerom knew not what to make of it; yet his good sense taught him to give a suitable version: "Ecce autem Core," &c.—Let us now see how latter critics have untied the knot. Houbigant derives *קח* from the Syriac *קח* *to be quarrelsome*: but this is a forced derivation.—I would rather, with Dathe, derive it from *קח*, *to murmur*; or from the Syr. *קח* *crocitare*; which comes to the same; and requires not even the rejection of the point *dagesh* in *koph*.—If neither of these derivations be deemed plausible, we must still have recourse to an *ellipsis*: and I know none more specious than that of Tharg. Jerus. or that of Delgado, *he took a resolution*: as we vulgarly say, *he took courage*.—In my version, I have, in imitation of Jerom*, given the meaning, without servilely adhering to the letter.

Ver. 11. *For, what is Aaron . . .* The original is *אשר עושה אהרן*, which perhaps might be better rendered, *For, what hath Aaron done?*—Delgado: *What have ye to do with Aaron?*

* And so, elegantly, Castalio: "Coierunt autem Cora," &c.—Nor is Bate's version much inferior (abating his fanciful orthography): "And Korah, the son of Ijer, the son of Ket, the son of Levi: and Dathan and Abiram sons of Abab, and Aven the son of Pelet; sons of Reuben, conspired together," &c.

manner as other historians; and that they were not equally liable both to mistake, and misrepresent. This, I trust, I shall be able to make appear, when, in my General Preface, I come to treat on the particular character of the Hebrew historians. At present I shall content myself with referring my reader, with respect to the occurrence here mentioned, to the free Remark of Eichhorn on Michaëlis's Notes, in the first volume of *Allgemeine Bibliothek*, p. 911; or Rosenmüller's Latin account of it, in the second volume of his *Scholæ*, p. 214.

Ver. 32. *All the men who had joined Korah.* כָּל הָאֲדָמִים אֲשֶׁר לְקֹרַח—Sep. πάντας τοὺς ἀνδράσιν τοὺς οὐτοὺς μετὰ Κορε—and so equivalently the other versions; except Vulg. in which the whole comma is omitted. Our common version has, "all the men that appertained to Korah." But this must be restricted to those only who were his accomplices; for his sons were not included, as we learn from ch. 26. 11.

Ver. 38. *For a covering to the altar.* אֲפֹרֶת לַמִּזְבֵּחַ—Sep. περιβόλαιον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. The altar seems to have been sheathed over with the plates.

Ver. 40. This verse, as it is at present, appears to me bald and defective. "That he be not as Korah and his company: as the Lord said to him by the hand of Moses." Such is our common version, in which the words *to him* must be referred to Eleazar so far back as the beginning of ver. 39. or something must be wanting after the word *company*. That want is supplied by Syr. which I have inserted in my version; but not without some doubt of its authenticity. However, it can do no harm there; since it is properly distinguished.

Ver. 44. *The Lord spoke to them.* The present Heb. and Sam. texts have *to Moses*, וְאֶל מֹשֶׁה: but Sep. more properly τῷ Μωϋσῃ καὶ Ααρων. So Syr. and Saadiah: and it is clear from the context, that the words were addressed to both. I have therefore rendered *to them*; not to repeat the words *Moses and Aaron* in the same verse.

C H A P. XVII.

Ver. 7. *THE testimonial-tent.* אֶתֶּן אֶת־הָאֵל—Sep. ἔθηκεν τὸ μαρτυριον. It is thus distinguished from אֶתֶּן אֶת־הָאֵל, or the whole convention-tent.

C H A P. XVIII.

Ver. 7. *THE* division of this verse in the pointed Hebrew is evidently faulty. The *albnoch*, or *colon*, should be placed after עֲבֹרָתָהּ, as it is in the Sam. text. See Houbigant. It is remarkable that Gr. Ven. so divides: καὶ λατρεύσετε λατρείαν, δάρον δάσω τὴν ἱερουσλήν ἔμω. So rightly also the Perfic translator. The Septuagint either read not וְאֶת in their copy, or neglected to render it.

Ver. 12. *The choicest, &c.* כָּל דָּלֵב, *omnem pinguedinem*. The word דָּלֵב is often used to denote the best of every thing; much in the same manner as we use the word *cream*. Thus, the Greeks called the finest flour, and the finest bread, *the fat of the wheat*. Στεαρ τῶν, οὐ καλλίστος σίτος—καὶ ἄρτος. Suidas.

Ver. 21. *All the tribes of Israel.* The Levites had no territory allowed to them but their cities and suburbs. But they were otherwise most plentifully provided for. Beside the *tribes*

of all Israel, which must have been great indeed, considering the disproportion of the number of Levites to that of the other tribes together; they had moreover the *first-fruits*, a *portion* of every victim whose blood was not carried into the sanctuary, and a *share* in every animal slain for common use. See Le Clerc's Commentary: and what can be said in favour of those regulations, and the *Levitical aristocracy*, in Michaëlis's *Mosaïsches Recht*. tom. i. sect. 52. p. 283.

Ver. 27. *And this heave-offering shall be accounted, &c.* תחשב לכם תרומתכם. But the Sam. copy has תרומתכם* in the plural; and so Sep. τα ἀφαιρέματα ὑμῶν. And this, perhaps, is the better reading. But all the other versions read in the singular.

Ver. 29. *Every heave-offering.* כל תרומה. But the word כל is wanting in 10 Heb. and 1 Chald. ms. and was not read by Sep. Vulg. Saad.

Ver. 31. *The rest.* That is, what remained of the tithes and gift-offerings given to the Levites, after a part of the best of them had been assigned to Aaron, as an heave-offering.—In the Hebrew phraseology, the third person is often put for either of the other two, as the occasion requires: here in ver. 30. ללוי is for לכם.

C H A P. XIX.

Ver. 2. *AN heifer . . . which hath never borne the yoke.* The same usage was observed by the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans; testimonies of which the reader may see in Bochart †.

Ver. 3. *And cause her to be slaughtered:* וסחט אותה; by Montanus rendered *et mactabit eam*; and even by Jerom, *immolabit*; as if the victim were to be slain by Eleazar. But סחט, here and in other places, is to be considered either as an impersonal verb, or taken in a coactive sense.—So Luther: *schlaechten lassen*—and Le Clerc: *mactari curabit*. This, however, did not please Houbigant; who thinks that the original reading was שחט, because the Septuagint render σφαζουσιν. But this is no certain proof, that they read in the plural: although they properly enough expressed an Hebrew singular, (as they elsewhere do,) that it might not be thought that Eleazar was the *slaughterer*. Our English translators, then, did well, after their scrupulous manner, to add an Italic *one* before the words “shall slay.” But it was not necessary to put it in Italics, as it is implied in שחט, according to the Hebrew idiom; as much as in the Latin *oportet me loqui*, “it behoves me to speak,” the word *it* is included in the word *oportet*.

Ver. 8. *Shall wash his clothes in water.* The words “in water,” במים, are wanting in one of Kennicott's mss. and were at first wanting in four of De Rossi's. They are also wanting in P. P. Levit. 16. 28. Nor were they read by Syr. Vulg. and most copies of Sep. But they are in all the other versions down to Gr. Ven. inclusively.

Ver. 9. *A special purification-water:* מֵי נִדָּה; by our translators rendered “a water of separation;” after Pagninus. But Sep. ὕδωρ παρυσμῶν—Vulg. *aquam aspersionis*: and so equivalently the other versions, except Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. the former of which has מֵי אֲרִישׁ, *aqua piaculi*; the latter ὕδωρ μαρμῶν, of much the same import.—From a comparison of the roots נִדָּה and נִדָּח, I am led to think, that the meaning of נִדָּה here is a *purification* of a *special* kind; composed for the purpose of purifying persons from certain stains, that required not the

* Although wrongly rendered in the Polyglott *elevatio vestra*.

† Hieroz. l. 11. c. 33.

interference of the priest.—Houbigant follows the Vulgate ; and blames Le Clerc for translating *aquam impuritatis* : “ contortè *aqua impuritatis pro aqua qua tollitur impuritas*.”—But this is one of Houbigant’s peevish observations. Had he forgotten that *חַטָּאת* signifies both *sin* and an offering for sin : *peccatum, et oblatio qua tollitur peccatum* ?

Ver. 12. It is justly observed by Delgado, that the last colon of this verse is erroneously rendered in our vulgar translation*, which runs thus : “ but if he purify himself not the third day, “ then the seventh day he shall not be clean :” nor was this error corrected by Purver or Bate. Sep. *εαν δε μη αψωγισθη τη ημερα τη τριτη και τη ημερα τη εβδομη, ου καθαρος εσται*. Nothing can better express the original than this version ; with which agree Syr. and Onk. although their Latin versions in Pol. make them speak otherwise by being badly pointed.—Saadias, to prevent mistakes, judged it proper to render thus : “ and if he be not purified on both these (NOTE) “ days, he shall not be clean.”—So, latterly, Dathe : *quod si his diebus non fuerit expiatus, manet impurus*.—And Michaëlis : “ entschündiget er sich an diesen beiden tagen nicht, so bleibt “ er unrein.”—There was no need of departing from Luther’s more literal, and more elegant version.

C H A P. XX.

THIS chapter is not at all connected with the preceding one. What is related in it must have happened many years after ; as has been well remarked by Delgado, who blames our English translators for rendering the copulative *Then*. He would render *Now* : but I see little difference between *then* and *now*. The copulative *vau* is often, very often, a mere expletive, which in a translation is better omitted.

Ver. 3. *Reproached them*. The present text has : *reproached Moses* ; or, as our common version has it, “ chode with Moses.”—And so Sep. *και ελαιοδρεπε ο λαος προς Μωυση*—and all the other versions save Vulg. and Syr. What the former read is uncertain ; as he paraphrases thus : *Et, versi in seditionem, dixerunt, &c.* But the latter has *וַתִּצְעַק עִם מֹשֶׁה וְעִם אַהֲרֹן* ; and this reading is still preserved in one of Kennicott’s mss. *על משה ועל אהרן*. This reading I have followed in my version : only, not to repeat “ Moses and Aaron,” I have used the relative *them*.

Ver. 13. *By which the Lord glorified himself*. The order of the Hebrew is this : “ These “ were the waters of Meriba, on account of which the children of Israel contended with the “ Lord, and he was glorified by them, or in them.” The word *them* is commonly referred to the Israelites : but I am inclined to think that *waters* are the antecedent ; and have shaped my version accordingly.

Ver. 19. *In the highway*. *בַּמִּסְלָה*. The Septuagint † seem to have read *בַּמִּסְלָה*, which is still the reading of 3 Sam. mss. and was most probably the original reading of the Sam. text ; as

* As well as in all the preceding ones from Tindall downwards : and so indeed most modern translators have rendered ; misled, I presume, by Jerom, who has : “ si die tertio aspersus non fuerit, septimo non poterit emundari.” Luther, however, followed a better guide, the Septuagint version, and has accordingly well rendered : “ und wo er sich nicht “ am dritten tage und am siebenten tage entschündiget, so wird er nicht rein werden.” Junius, too : *quod si non purgabit se die tertio et die septimo, non erit mundus*. And Diodati, in his marginal version : *se non si fara purificato al terzo giorno ne al settimo, non fara netto*.

† Παρα το ορος παρελεουσμεθα.

it is preserved in the Sam. version. But as none of the other versions favour this reading, and as the other reading appears to be preferable, I have followed it; although I would not, with our lexicographers, derive מסלה from סלל, but from מסל, which in Arab. denotes a *direct line*, an open way.

C H A P. XXI.

Ver. 1. *BY the way of Atharim.* דרך האתרים. Sep. ὁδὸν Αθαρημ*—Vulg. *per exploratorum viam*: followed by most interpreters, among which our own: “by the way of the spies.” This is supposed to be the way by which the Israelitic spies went up to explore the land of Chanaan. But אתר is not the term for a spy, nor can it regularly be derived from אתר. Michaëlis thinks it signifies *place*, from its having that meaning in Chald. Syr. and Samaritan; and would render: “the king of Arad hearing that the Israelites were on the way to those places.” But I doubt very much if the Hebrew will bear such a version, without an אל after דרך. The prefix ה, indeed, would induce one to suspect that אתרים were an appellative: but proper names have sometimes that prefix: and if האתרים were a tribe, or petty nation, I should render, “by the way of the Atharites:” but the name of no such people occurring elsewhere, I thought it best to retain the Hebrew name, with Sep. Saadias, and Dathe.

Ver. 3. *Whom, with their cities, they devoted to destruction.* These cities must have been only those that touched on the Desert. Compare Josh. 12. 14. Shuckford deemed the first colon of this verse an interpolation; and Bp. Law seems to have been of the same opinion.

Ver. 8. *Fery serpents.* דוחשים ושרפים. Sep. τὰς σφεις τὰς θανατοῦσας, *deadly serpents*—Vulg. *ignitos serpentes*—and so equivalently Onkelos and both Arabs—Syr. *dire serpents*—Michaëlis takes שרף to be the *cerastes*, or *regulus*. I believe it to be the *dipsas*, otherwise called *prester*; and so the word is here rendered by Gr. Ven. τὰς σφεις τὰς τοξοειδῆς.

Ver. 14. The fragment of supposed poetry, contained in this and the next verse, has always been deemed a most difficult passage; and various attempts have been made to explain it, which I will not now detail †; as I flatter myself that my own explanation will, on examination, appear to be the true one. I change not a single letter in the text: I only read אתרב in one word, with seven mss. and exclude the *vau* before אשר with the Sam. copy. I then point after מלחמת, and thus distribute the remainder:

יהוה אתרב במדבר
ואת הנחלים ארנון אשר
הנחלים אשר נטה לשבת-ע'
ונשע לנבול מצאב.

Dominus se dedit in turbine, et torrentes Arnon effudit; torrentes quæ deflexerunt ad Shebotb-Ar, et declinârunt ad limitem Moab.—The people were in want of water. A tempest of rain swelled the Arnon, the channel of which was probably dry before: and this torrent sinking along the adjacent plain afforded wells of water wheresoever they dug for it, from Mathana to the vale of Moab. This, I think, explains the whole passage from ver. 13 to the end of the chapter.

* Gr. Ven. ὁδὸν τῶν Αθαριων.

† I shall only give the version of Sep. because it is singular: Δια τούτων λεγεται εν τη βιβλῳ Πόλεμος του Κυριου την Ζωον εφλογισα, και τους χειμαρρους Αρνων. Instead of ורב, they are supposed to have read ורב, and to have taken it in a figurative sense. But whence had they εφλογισα? I am persuaded their text is here corrupted; or they must have read very differently from our present Hebrew text.

I can see but two critical objections, that can be made to my version. The first is, that מרחם is not in the Hebrew but in the Aramean form. But this is not the only place where this form is observed: and here we may consider it as an *archaism*. It may also be objected, that I give to נסח and נסח a plural signification: but every scholar knows that, in Hebrew, this is no uncommon *enallage*; especially when words are used distributively. Thus, Job 12. 7. "Ask the beasts, and *it* (that is, *each of the beasts*) will teach thee"—נִסְחָם נִסְחָם וְנִסְחָם.—So Jerem. 35. 14. דְּבַר יִזְחָב: "The words (i. e. every word) of Jonadab was confirmed."

Ver. 16. *Thence* was obtained a well. נִסְחָם בְּאֵרָה: commonly rendered: "Thence they went to Beer." But not so Sep. *Kau exiit ad p̄neap*—Vulg. *Ex eo loco apparuit puteus*—Onk. נִסְחָם בְּאֵרָה, *Thence a well was given to them*.—Syr. also took בְּאֵרָה for an appellative, and in the nominative case; and so Tharg. Bab. The rest, indeed, consider בְּאֵרָה here as a place, on account of the ה final: but I take בְּאֵרָה to be an Aramean *archaism*, as well as מרחם.

Ver. 17. *A well hath sprung up! Resound applause!* The present text is עָלֵי בְּאֵר עֲנֵי לָהּ, by our translators rendered: "Spring up, O well! Sing ye unto it:" and so the word עָלֵי was understood by Onk. Tharg. Syr. Saad. and Perf.*—Sep. took עָלֵי for a preposition; *ἐπὶ τῷ φρεατί*: and, what is very remarkable, the Gr. of Venice has, likewise, *ἐπὶ φρεατί*. But the Sam. reading עָלָה I take to be the true reading, although here anomalous: as בְּאֵר is elsewhere a feminine; and the syntax would require עָלָה. I am persuaded, however, that בְּאֵר is here the nominative, not the vocative case; and that עָלָה is in the præterite, not in the imperative mood. Indeed, the sense to me appears to require this. It was natural for the Israelites to sing on the first appearance of water: but who would sing to water before it appeared?

Ver. 18. *A well which the chiefs discovered.* בְּאֵר חִפְּזָה שָׂרִים. I take חִפְּזָה to be here in the meaning *investigare, scrutari*. The chiefs sought and discovered the proper places to dig for water; and the people digged, in the places pointed out to them by the chiefs: or these, perhaps, began the work, which the people afterwards finished. I must here remark, that the Septuagint version is grossly mispointed in the Aldine and Roman editions: *ἐξαρχῆται αὐτῶ φρεατὶ ἀνῆλθον αὐτοὶ ἀρχῆταις*: and the Latin version in Pol. follows this faulty division. Not so Compl. which has a comma after αὐτῶ: but better still Grabe, who puts a colon after αὐτῶ.

Ib. *The volunteers of the people*: נְרִיבֵי הָעָם—Sep. *basilides εὐνοῶν*—Vulg. *duces multitudinis*—and so equivalently Syr. Onk. Tharg. Saad.—Our translators imitated them: "the nobles of the people:" and similarly most modern translators, down to Dathe and Michaëlis. I am persuaded, that there is neither *kings*, nor *princes*, nor *nobles*, in the sentence; and that נְרִיבֵי הָעָם means such of the people as volunteered themselves to dig the wells marked out by the chiefs. So Erpen. and the Persian translator; and so admirably well Gr. Ven. *συμμεγεται τι λεω*.

Ib. *By delving with their slaves.* בְּמִסְחָק בְּמִסְחָקָם. The word בְּמִסְחָק is commonly rendered, *with the lawgiver*; or, as our public version, "by the direction of the lawgiver." Purver: *by means of the lawgiver*†.—The original and literal meaning of מִסְחָק is *scudere, exscalpere, excidere*: and

* The Vulg. *ascendat puteus* is equivalent to an imperative.

† The antients vary. Sep. *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτῶν*—

But a ms. has *ἐν βασιλείᾳ*, a more probable reading.—Vulg. *in datus legis*.—Onk. seems to have read מִסְחָקָם without

and in that sense מַדְבָּר is to be taken here. The Sam. copy reads a *vau* before מַדְבָּר; wrongly, I think: at least, it must be accounted an expletive.

1b. *From the wilderness to Mathana, &c.* This abrupt comma is commonly rendered: "And from the wilderness they went to Mattanah; or, as I write it, *Mathana*. Instead of מַדְבָּר the Septuagint read מַתָּנָה or מַתְנָה, as they render *καὶ πρὸς φεσντος*. This reading is followed by Houbigant, Dathe, and Michaëlis; and is indeed very plausible. Yet I am inclined to prefer the common reading, which is also that of the Sam. copy; and of all the versions, save Sep.—The meaning of the whole passage is this, I think: *Mathana*, which denotes a *gift*, is the torrent of ruin which the Lord gave them in a tempest from the mountains at the source of the Arnon. This torrent supplied them with water, from the time when they left the wilderness, mentioned in ver. 11, until they came to the vale of Moab, mentioned ver. 20.—Such I take to be the genuine meaning of the text; of which Dr. Kennicott has given a version (*de sa façon*) in his Critical Remarks, which the reader may see at p. 66; and, if he like it better than mine, let him adopt it instead of mine.

Ver. 27—30. Another piece of sententious poetry, not easy to be understood. It is ushered in by these words: עַל כֵּן יִמְדּוּ מִסְלִים—Sep. *Διὰ τὸτο εἰρησὶν οἱ ἀνυπακούσαι**—Vulg. *Idcirco dicitur in proverbio*. And so equivalently the other versions; and so our English translation: "wherefore they that speak in proverbs." But all this gives a faint idea of the meaning of מִסְלִים. The word מִסַּל, as a verb, signifies to speak *nobly*, and *figuratively*: and what else is this but to *poetize*? The language of the poets, particularly of the oriental poets, is often highly *parabolical*; or, to speak more properly, *hyperbolical*; and hence their sayings may be called *parables*: but *proverbs*, in its common acceptation, is an improper term. The piece of poetry here quoted is by some thought to be that of an Amorite bard, who related the conquests of Sihon over the Moabites. I cannot be of that opinion: I believe it to be the work of a Hebrew poet; who, after the defeat of Sihon, and the overthrow of his capital city, excites his countrymen to rebuild and repair it, as the strongest city of that territory, which had formerly defeated the Moabites, and might still be made a formidable rival to Ar. Considered in this light, it is a beautiful fragment of an old ballad, quoted by the writer of the Pentateuch: but such a quotation could not be made by Moses; although Moses may have composed the ballad.

Ver. 28. *Which consumed Ar of Moab.* Ar was the capital city of the Moabites; which had been, probably, ravaged by Sihon. There is, however, a various reading here, which is not improbable. Instead of עַר the Sam. copy has עֵר; and this is the reading of 2 Heb. mss. and was at first that of 4 more. So also Sep. *עֵר*.—Syr. is also supposed by De Rossi to have had before him the same reading: but this, I think, is a mistake. The Polyglott edition has indeed

without the preposition. The rest paraphrase the best they can. The Persian translator alone appears to me to have rightly rendered the passage: "The volunteers of the people digged it, by digging with their slaves."—Nor badly, although barbarously, Gr. Ven. *ἐν τοῖς σκλάβοις*; agreeable to which is the Sam. version.—The word מַעֲבָדִים is rendered *flours* by all the antients; except Sep. in which we find *ἐν τῇ κορμύσσει αὐτῶν*!—It is yet common among shepherds, in some parts of this island, to dig wells with slaves; which are pointed for that purpose: I have seen them at such work. In the sandy regions of the East, wells are easily dug. Sometimes water is found at the depth of a foot and a half; sometimes at two feet. See Niebuhr, vol. i. p. 103. French edition. * Gr. Ven. *Διὰ τὸ τὰς ἐν παραβολαῖς*.

עַד instead of עַר; but the translator could not have so read in his copy, as he makes עַד a town of Moab: וַאֲכָלֹתָ לָעַד דְּמוֹאב. I have, then, no doubt of לָעַד being the original reading of Syr. although the diacritic point has been changed in the copy followed in the Polyglott.— Singular is the reading of Gr. Ven. τῶν Ἀγῶν τῶν Μοαβίτων.

1b. *Which devoured Bamoth-Arnon.* The present text has בְּלִי בְּמֹת אַרְנוֹן: by our translators rendered “the lords of the high-places of Arnon.”—Vulg. *habitatores excelforum Arnon.*—Onkelos and the Targumists understand בְּלִי to be the *priests* of the high-places of Arnon. I believe that the Septuagint have followed the true reading בְּעֵרָה, κατεπίσθεντες Ἀρῶν. They render בְּמֹת στήλας: but as I take בְּמֹת־אַרְנוֹן to be the name of a place, the same with that mentioned ver. 19, I have retained the Hebrew words.

Vcr. 30. This verse has, in my apprehension, been strangely misunderstood and misinterpreted. The text is תִּירִים—*אִבְרָ חֲשֹׁבֶן עַד דִּיבֹן וְנָשִׁים עַד † דִּנְפָּח אֲשֶׁר ‖ עַד מִדְבָּה—by Montanus rendered; *Et jugum eorum periiit, Chesbon usque ad Dibon, et desolari fecimus usque ad Nophach, quæ usque ad Medeba*: by our English translators: “We have shot at them: Heshbon “is perished even unto Dibon, and we have laid them waste even unto Nopach, which *reacheth* “unto Medeba &c.”—But both these versions, and indeed almost all modern translations, are, to me, unintelligible.—Let us see what light can be derived from the antients. Sep. Καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν ἀπολείπεται Ἐσεβῶν, εἰς Δαβῶν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ¶ ἐπὶ προσέχειν αὐτῶν πῦρ ἐπὶ Μωαβ. This, at first sight, appears a very singular version: but it admits a consistent meaning, and can be plausibly defended. Some critics have imagined that they read in their copy נָּ instead of נִיר, because they render σπέρμα: but σπέρμα, I suspect, is here to be taken for the *seed of the field*; or the *corn-fields* themselves: and in that case there is no need of supposing that they read otherwise than we now do; the vowel points only being changed. So far, then, the Septuagint version is correct and just: and the following words are also justly rendered; but the version is mispointed and mistranslated in the Polyglott. The comma should not be placed after ἀπολείπεται, as it is in Ald. Rom. and Alex. but after Ἐσεβῶν, or omitted altogether as in Compl. which is, in many places, more correctly printed than the other editions. Then, ἀπολείπεται is mistranslated *periiit*; whereas it should be *perdidit*, Ἐσεβῶν being the nominative. Hitherto, then, all is well: but how justify the remaining part of their version? Here indeed I think they made some mistakes: they took נָשִׁים to be a single word, meaning *wives*, αἱ γυναῖκες: they took עַד before דִּיבֹן for a *conjunction*: they read with Sam. דִּנְפָּח and אֲשֶׁר; made the former a verb in the singular** with a nominative plural, and אֲשֶׁר its objective: and, lastly, they, with Sam. read עַל after אֲשֶׁר, and מוֹאב for מִדְבָּה. Their version then might, in English, be rendered thus: “Their corn-fields as far as Dibon, they (that is, the Heshbonites) destroyed; and their women fanned the fire †† against Moab.”—Now, who will say,

* Sam. better, אֲבֹרָה—† Sam. חֲנִינָה—‡ Sam. אֲשֶׁר—|| Sam. עַל. § Cov. “Their glory is come to nought,” &c.—Matth. “Their light is out,” &c.—The rest down to Gen. inclusively: “Their empire is lost,” &c.—Ainsworth and Tate: “Their lamp is destroyed,” &c.—Furver: “We shooting at them,” &c.—Delgado contents himself with observing, that expositors differ so much about the sense, that he thinks himself obliged to give two versions. One of these is: “And as we shot at them Heshbon perished,” &c. The other: “And their dominion, even that of Heshbon, “perished,” &c.—I omit reporting the other foreign versions, which all agree with one or other of the above.

¶ Comp. Ald. Alex. and some mss. add αὐτῶν: but it is wanting in Copt. ** Unless they perhaps read אֲבֹרָה.

†† The radical meaning of נָפַח is *inflate, insufflate*; and hence *succendere ignem*.

that this is not a plausible version?—More plausible, and more probable, it certainly is than any other antient version; in the supposition that they had the genuine text before them, and misread it not.—But, every thing considered, I am inclined to think that the present text is correct; except, perhaps, that the Sam. readings *על-דפח-אבדו* (which last is the reading of one Heb. and one Chald. ms.) are preferable to *על-נפח-אבדו*. But this is not of much consequence: so I leave the text as it is; and thus arrange it:

תִּירֶם אֶבֶר חֶשְׁבֹן עַד דִּיכָן וְנִשְׂיָם עַד נַפְחַי אֲשֶׁר עַד מִדְבָּא.

That Heshbon is here in the nominative case, is clear from ver. 28; for it is from Heshbon that "a fire went forth to destroy Moab, and from the city of Sihon a flame;" not certainly to consume itself, but to consume the territory, and even the capital, of Moab. This is the first step towards clearing the passage. Then, *אבד*, or rather *אבדו*, is to be considered as an active verb, or in *Piel**, and pointed as above. Thirdly, *נִיר* is evidently a noun, as it was taken by all the antients down to Gr. Ven. and, from the context, must here mean *full fields of corn*†; as *נִישׁ*. I think, denotes *fallow fields*; from *נִשַּׁשׁ*, which in Syr. and Arab. signifies *terra iners, infeminata*. On these presumptions I have formed my version; which is, at least, intelligible, and consistent with the context. Let those, who shall be displeased with it, frame a better ‡.

C H A P. XXII.

ABBOT Jerusalem and some other modern critics are of opinion, that Moses inserted the history of Balaam, as an episode, from Moabite memoirs, for the purpose of obviating pressing difficulties; in the supposition that Moses himself was the original writer. I believe, it was written, not by Moses, but by the compiler of the Pentateuch, from such traditional stories, or scraps of written documents, as he could find. Indeed, it has all the air of a legendary tale.

Ver. 5. *The river of the land of Ammon.* The present text has *רְחוֹת אֶרֶץ בְּנֵי עַמּוֹ*: "The river of the land of the children of his people." And so Sep. Onk. both Arabs. Perf. and Gr. Ven. But Sam. Vulg. Syr. and several mss. have *עַמְּךָ*; which is, in my opinion, preferable to the other, were it merely for this reason: that it is an odd way to define a man's country, by calling it the land of his own people. See Kennicott's Remarks; and Houbigant *in loc.* It is objected by Le Clerc and Rosenmüller, that the *Euphrates*, the river here meant, was at too great a distance from the Ammonites to be called "a river of their land." But it is very uncertain how nearly the borders of Ammon were to that river; and the word *עַל*, as Houbigant remarks, may be rendered *towards*.

Ver. 6. *Curse for me this people.* The antients believed that *blessing* or *curfing*, by those who were accounted *prophets*, was of great consequence. See Le Clerc *in loc.*

* The Perse translator saw this, but mistook its nominative. † So Syr. understood the Heb. word: and Gr. Ven. has the very word *νεωπα*. ‡ I shall here add four other versions, for the sake of their authors.—That of Houbigant is: *Eorum culta novalia perdidit Hesebon, usque ad Dibon; vastata sunt usque ad Nephse, versus Medaba.*—That of Kennicott: "But we have cast upon them destruction, from Heshbon unto Dibon: and we have laid waste into Nophah; the fire was unto Medeba." See his Remarks, p. 67.—That of Dathe: *Sagittis eos confestim, perit Hesebon usque ad Dibonem, vastavimus usque ad Nephseam, conflagramus omnia usque ad Medebam.*—That of Michaëlis: "Ihre schönen acker sind verwüthet, von Hesebon bis nach Dibon, verwüthet bis nach Nofach; trümmern zerflörter städte sind bis nach Medeba."—Quodvis, elegit.

Ver. 8. *What the Lord shall say to me.* **לֵאמֹר כִּי יֹאמַר יְהוָה**. This proves, either that *Jehovah* was Balaam's God, or that the historian has put words in Balaam's mouth, which he could not utter. See the Rem. on Levit. i. 3. The conduct of Balaam, on this occasion, is thus explained by Jerusalem, and his followers. They suppose Balaam to have been an egregious impostor, who had acquired the reputation of being a prophet, and made a public traffic of his divinary art. He might have learned from Balak's messenger the superior strength of the Israelite army, and perhaps their fame had reached him before that period: hence it was an easy matter for him to foretell that the Moabites would be overcome, if they should go to war. If therefore he had complied with Balak's wish, and cursed the Israelites, he ran the risk of seeing his curse ineffectual, and his art detected. But, by blessing them, he lost nothing of his former fame: on the contrary, even the Moabites themselves would be inclined to give him more credit, than if he had cursed their enemies. For that purpose, he artfully feigns frequent consultations with God, and delivers his own ideas for divine oracles.—These suppositions granted, it is thought that the difficulties attending his history are removed*.

Ver. 18. *Balak's chiefs.* The present text has **עֲבָדֵי בָלָק**: *Balak's servants*: and so Onk. Tharg. Syr. Perf. Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. But I prefer the reading of Sep. **שָׂרֵי בָלָק**, which is that of one of Kennicott's mss. and was followed by Saadiaz. In Vulg. the comma is wanting: it has only *Respondit Balaam*: but nothing for **שָׂרֵי בָלָק** (or **עֲבָדֵי**) **וְהָאֵל**.

Ib. *Were Balak to give me his house-full of silver, &c.* Balaam affects to be a person of the highest integrity and disinterestedness†; yet it appears lucre was in his heart. See verses 22 and 32.

Ver. 22. *God was incensed against him.* I shall here give the substance of Rosenmüller's Note: "Qui veram historiam hic narrari putant, ii difficultate inexplicabili impediuntur; quomodo nempe Deus irasci potuerit, quod Bileamus proficisceretur; quum tamen ipse proficisci permiserit ver. 20. Nonnulli dicunt Deum ideo esse iratum Bileamo, quod is ierit animo nocendi; alii, post Clericum, verba illa versûs 20. significasse: *permitto tibi proficisci cum legatis, si modo abs te nihil petant, quod sit præceptis meis contrarium.* Verum equidem fatcor me non intelligere, quid sibi Clericus cum hac difficultatis solutione voluerit: nec hujusmodi responsonibus erit opus, si Jerusalemii sententiam adsumamus." Now I confess, I do not see how, even in the hypothesis of Jerusalem, the difficulty is solved. Admitting the story to be a Moabite story, and in part a fiction, still the writer would feign with some degree of consistency. A better way, then, to reconcile ver. 20. with ver. 22. is to admit, in the latter, the addition in Saadiaz **וְהָאֵל מְאֵד מְאֵד מְאֵד**: *Then God was wroth, because he (Balaam) was going with a covetous disposition.* So Peter, 2 Ep. 2. 15. **ὡς περὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡγαγόντων.**

Ver. 23. The story of Balaam's ass has often been an object of ridicule: and the critic above mentioned, Jerusalem, thinks that it was all a fiction of Balaam's, to save himself from obloquy if he should bless, instead of cursing, the Israelites‡. To me, there appears nothing strange

* "Si, his observationibus ductibus, quæ aunc sequuntur legamus, nullæ in iis difficultates obviæ erunt." Rosenmüller.

† "Simulat Bileamus se hominem esse integerrimum, et ab omni lucri cupiditate alienissimum: id quod sine dubio legatis Balaki eo majorem de illo opinionem injicere debebat." Rosenmüller.

‡ "Si recordamur eorum, quæ supra ad ver. 8. dicta sunt, sponte intelligamus totam hanc, quæ nunc sequitur, narrationem de asina, a Bileamo

strange in the story of the ass, but the manner of telling it : and that ceases to be wonderful, when we recollect the oriental mode of narrating. Balaam is riding on his ass, on as yet a doubtful errand : the ass startles at something, and turns aside from the way ; thrusts her master's leg against a wall, and at length falls down under him. All this he takes for a bad omen, and a sign that his journey is not agreeable to God : God is thence conceived to be angry with him, and an imaginary dialogue ensues between God and Balaam, as had before been supposed to be held between Balaam and his ass. I believe there are few gentlemen who have not held such dialogues with their horses. I have frequently conversed with mine : and, indeed, an occurrence once happened to me not unfamiliar to what happened to Balaam. I was riding on a favourite little mare, in a very narrow path, which had a high wall on one side and a deep rapid river on the other. All at once my palfrey stopped short, and wanted to wheel about and return. It was not, however, an angel which she saw—although it had wings : it was a dead crow lying in the path ; and which, without alighting, I could not get my mare to pass. I was scarcely on her back again, when, a loose stone falling from the top of the wall about three paces before her nose, she jumped aside with vehemence ; and although she did not thrust my leg against the wall, she threw herself and me into the river : and if she had not been an excellent swimmer, we should have both been drowned. It may be readily supposed, that I was angry. Whether, if I had had a sword in my hand, I should have threatened to slay my mare, I know not : but certain it is, that I scolded her egregiously, and would probably have beaten her most unmercifully, if this same story of Balaam's ass had not naturally presented itself to my view. My poor pony seemed to say, in a piteous tone : “ Am I not “ thine own mare, upon which thou hast ridden since ever I came into thy possession ? Was I “ ever wont to do to thee so before ? ” This she seemed to say as effectually, as if God had opened her mouth : so effectually, that I instantly said “ No,” and gently lowered the suspended whip.—Now, if the manners of our country resembled the manners of Balaam's country, and our style of writing their style ; and if I had, like Balaam, been reputed a prophet or soothsayer ; and, in that character, been sent for by the king or his ministers to curse the French (for example) ; and if this accident had happened to me on the road ; would it not have been considered as a sign from heaven, that my journey was not a lucky one ? And perhaps I should have been inclined to stop, and return ; unless the *wages of unrighteousness* had tempted me to go on : in which case, I should, most probably, have imagined that an angel of God bade me proceed, &c. &c.—Such an occurrence would, by an oriental historian, be narrated in the dramatic manner in which we have the story of Balaam's ass, and many other such stories in the Hebrew writings*.

Ver. 32. *I am come out to oppose thee.* אֲנִי יֹאמֵר לְעָרֶיךָ. So the Sam. copy, with Sep. and most of the ant. versions. The present Heb. has לְעָרֶיךָ : but the final *capb* has been dropt, from its

“ Bileamo sciam esse hoc sine, ne ab ejus auctoritate detraheretur, si Israelitis bene præcaturus esset. Sunt enim huic “ historis tam multa inter se contraria, ut qui eam sine præconcepta opinione legat, primo statim intuitu videat eam esse “ viri versuti figmentum, quod homines duntaxat inculti et superstitione occæcati credere potuerunt.” Rosenmüller.— But is there not here a sort of contradiction ? If Balaam were *vir versutus*, he would, one might think, have made a better story. It is true, however, that story-makers often overdo. * If the story of Balaam and his ass be a literal story, we may say with Le Clerc : *Aut Bileamus infamissimus, aut nescio quid de brutis sentiebat.* See the story of *Myiillus* and his *cock*, in Lucian.

contiguity

contiguity to the same letter in the next word. This must, probably, have happened before the books were written in Chaldee characters; or, at least, before final letters were distinguished from others.

Ib. *Because I know that thou goest with an evil intention.* The present Heb. is כִּי יָדַעְתִּי לְנַנֵּךְ; but Sam. כִּי הָרַע דְּרָכְךָ לְנַנֵּךְ: literally rendered, "because evil is thy way before me." But the דָּרַע is with some probability supposed to be a substitute made by the Sam. copyist* for an obscure word, יָרַע, the meaning of which, as it occurs only twice (here and in Job 16, 17) is not well known. In the common editions of Sep. it is rendered *ex asinus*: but in the Glasg. Oclateuch, and in some other mss. it is *ex asine*; and this is the reading of the Coptic version. The Italic is lost.—Vulg. *perversa*—which corresponds with Sep.—Both may have read as Sam.—The other ant. translators seem to have read יָרַע; which they took for a verb, but rendered it variously.—What, then, is its precise meaning? By comparing the root יָרַע with the Syr. יָרַע and the Arab. يَرِيع, we may venture to say, that it signifies *raft, devious, perverse*, and such like terms. In my version I have softened the figure into its equivalent English meaning.

Ver. 33. *The ass saw me, &c.* "Quis hic non videt inconcinnum hominis figmentum?" Rosenmüller.

Ver. 39. *Kiriath-buxoth.* קִרְיַת בֻּצְוֹת—Sam. קִרְיַת בֻּצְוֹת—Sep. *urbem quæ in extremis regni ejus finibus erat*: and if the root be בֻּצַע, as most probably it is, this paraphrase of Jerom's gives the meaning. I chose to retain the Hebrew name.

C H A P. XXIII.

Ver. 1. *BUILD here seven altars, &c.* One cannot help here observing, with the author of *Comment. and Essays, &c.* that "there is a remarkable resemblance, in the number and kind of animals, between this sacrifice of Balaam, and that which the Sibyl commanded Æneas to offer. *Æn. vi. 47.*"

*Nunc grege de intacto septem mactare juvencos
Præstiterit, totidem lectas de more bidentes.*

Ver. 3. *Holocausts.* The present text has עֹלֹת; but Sam. with more than 30 mss. have עֹלֹתִי: so also Syr. Yet Sep. with the other version read in the singular †.

Ib. *Now he went in anxious silence.* שָׁמַיִךְ, without a single various lection.—But what is the meaning of שָׁמַיִךְ? By Sep. it is rendered *velociter* §—Vulg. *alone*—Tharg. Bab. נִרְוָה, *crooked*: he adds by way of explanation כְּדֹדֵינָא, *like a serpent*: and perhaps the Sam. translator had the same notion, when he rendered מְסֻמָּה—Tharg. Jerus. בְּלֵב שָׁמַיִךְ, badly rendered in Pol. *corde contrito*: I think it should be rendered *animo tranquillo*—Syr. שָׁמַיִךְ, rendered in Pol. *sincere*: but which, I am inclined to think, has here the same signification as

* Yet I am rather inclined to think, that it has been an oversight of some copyist, whether a Samaritan or a Jew. In the ant. alphabet the *iota* might be mistaken for a *bé*, and the *teth* for an *ain*; and *vice versa*. What militates most against the Sam. lection is the prefix before דָּרַע. † They read קִרְיַת, and this is the reading of Syr.

‡ The addition which, on the authority of Sep. I have inserted in this verse, I firmly believe to have stood in the original: but the reader may think otherwise. § He seems to have had in view the Arab. مَدَد.

in Chald.—Saad. בִּי דָּרָךְ, which why it is rendered in Pol. *tranquille*, I own I cannot conceive. I think it should be rendered in *festinantia*, or *festinanter*, which corresponds with Vulg.—Arab. Erp. and Perf. follow Onkelos—and Gr. Ven. has μετὰρως.

Of modern interpreters, Pagninus followed Onkelos, and was followed by Munster, Castalio, the Tigurines, the French Genevans, the Spanish of Ferrara, and that of De Reyna. But Junius, Diodati, the Dutch, and our common English version, follow R. D. Kimhi, who thinks that שָׁם signifies a high-place here, as it does in Isaiah and Jeremiah: as if Balaam had gone to a higher place, than where the altars were, to consult God.—Others, on the contrary, think that שָׁם signifies a low-place, a plain; and the Septuagint are supposed to have so understood it, since they render αὐτῶν*.—Michaëlis, followed by Schulz and Rosenmüller, joins the two ideas. The place, to which Balaam went, was a plain open space on the mountain, *locus planus in monte*, "eine freie, mit keiner waldung bewachsene höhe des berges."

All these translators, save those who follow Onk. or Vulg. suppose שָׁם to be *in regimen*, and supply the preposition אֶל. I confess that this ellipsis appears to me, as it did to Dathe, a very harsh one, although it has been plausibly defended by Storr†. I think שָׁם is in concord, whatsoever meaning we give to it.—If it be here taken in its common Hebrew acceptation, we must, with Montanus, render *elatus*; "he went *elato capite*:" i. e. *confidently, securely*: but as, in this whole chapter, there are manifest *archaisms*, I am inclined to think, with Dathe, that the true meaning of שָׁם is *anxious, solicitous*: although I would not refer it to the Chald. שָׁמָּה; but to the Chald. and Arab. سَمَ.

Ver. 10. *The multitude*. אֶת רַבֵּעַ: commonly rendered *the fourth part*, and supposed to be in the genitive case. I cannot so think: the parallelism would thereby be lost; and the conjecture of Venema, although deemed unnecessary by Rosenmüller and Dathe, is confirmed by 4 Sam. mss. which, instead of וְכַסְפָּר, have וְכַסְפָּר, or כַּסְפָּר; and so read Sep. καὶ τὴν τέταρτον μερίδα τοῦ χρυσοῦ, ἰσραήλ? Saadias also must have had such a reading in his text; or have taken כַּסְפָּר for the participle of Phiel: which indeed it may be: and in that case the ו of the preceding comma is elegantly understood.—For the rest, I think, with Houbigant ‡, that רַבֵּעַ, or rather רַבְעָה, the Sam. lection, does not mean *a fourth part*; but *the whole people*.

Ib. *And like theirs be my latter end*. יָמֵי אַחֲרִיתִי כִּמְדֵי. The Septuagint took אַחֲרִית for posterity: γὰρ οὕτω τὸ σπέρμα μου ὡς τὸ σπέρμα τούτων: but Vulg. *stant novissima mea horum similia*: and so equivalently all the other versions. Most literally Gr. Ven. τὰς αἰῶνας μου ὡς αὐτῶν. The meaning of the colon is well expressed by Dathe: *Mori cupio, ut probi illi! idem sit meus, qui eorum exitus*.—Michaëlis labours to prove, that Balaam here expresses his hope of a blessed immortality§: "Sed hæc sententia (says justly Rosenmüller) hoc loco non apta videtur. Crediderim potius, illorum verborum sensum esse hunc: "Israelitæ tanta fruentur felicitate, qualem ipse mihi usque ad mortem opto. Quasi dicat: Utinam

* In favour of this rendering, a passage of St. Luke has been referred to (chap. 3. ver. 5.), where the Greek words αὐτῶν τα σκευὰ αἰς οὐδενος are by the Syr. translator rendered, כְּשֵׁם לְשֵׁם לְשֵׁם; and certainly כְּשֵׁם in that dialect signifies *a plain*; and, as a verb, *to make plain*. † In his *Observationes ad Analogiam et Syntaxin Hebræorum*, p. 272.

‡ "Ex potestate Arabica verbi רַבֵּעַ, quod de *accumulata arena* dicitur: quodque respondet priori "verbo עָפָר. Sic אֶת רַבְעָה est *multus, abundans*. Nec vero ab re Vulg. *stirpis*. Nam רַבֵּעַ est etiam, Arabicè, *prolem* "gignere in juvenute; affine verbo Hebræico *coire*."—Addere potuit idem רַבֵּעַ etiam significare *causam hominum*—familia—cetera, &c.

§ *Syntagma Comment. part. 1. p. 107.*

"*mibi contingat æque fortunatum mori!* Innuit, totum populum Israeliticum per omnia
 "futura tempora felicissimum fore, neque ullum malum esse experturum."

Ver. 16. *The Lord met Balaam.* So the present text. But instead of יְהוָה the Sam. copy has מַלְאֲכֵי יְהוָה, the angel of the Lord. Six Heb. mss. and 4 more, at first, have אֱלֹהִים instead of יְהוָה; and so Sep. and both Arabs.* Three mss. have now, or had at first, both readings, יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים. The two words have been so often interchanged by copyists, that it is impossible always to say, whether stood originally in the text.

Ver. 18. *Listen to me.* הִשְׁמָעָה עָדִי. So both texts; and a similar construction occurs in Job 32. 11. It must, however, be remarked, that the Septuagint considered עַד as a noun, and not as a preposition. Their version is, ἐννοεω μαρτυρῶς, give ear, as a witness. They seem not to have read the affix after עַד, or to have neglected it. On their version Michaëlis formed his: "*sey aufmerksam, und sey mein zeuge:*" *be attentive, and be my witness.* The Syr. translator also took עַד for a noun, but in the objective case, and signifying not *a witness*, but *testimony*, עֲדָתִי לְשׁוֹמְרֵי; and I am not sure but this is the true meaning. The other ancient translators who have rendered עַד by *my word* or *words* most probably considered עַד as a noun. Thus, Saad. אֲמַרְתָּ לְקָדִי—Sam. v. אֲמַרְתָּ מַעֲדָתִי—and even the most literal Gr. Ven. has here ἐννοεω μαρτυρῶς.—On the whole, then, I am much inclined to think that עַד, both here and in Job; and also in some other similar cases, ought to be rendered *testimony*.—Before I quit this verse, I cannot help animadverting on an hypercriticism of Houbigant; who deems צָוָה בְּנִי a solecism, although it be the reading of both texts, without any variety oflection in the mss.—It is an elegant Arabism, or poetical licence; and gives here a peculiar emphasis to the line.

Ver. 21. *I behold nothing harmful.* The present text has וְרָאִיתִּי, *be beholds*; and so read both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven. But Onk. Tharg. Syr. and the Sam. text and version read in the first person אֲרִאֵה; and this, I am persuaded, is the true reading †, followed by Dathe, *Non video malum inter Jacobitas*; better than Houbigant's *non videbo*, in the future.—For the rest, אֵין in this comma signifies neither *iniquity* nor *sin*; but *harm, ill, trouble* of any kind. See the Arab أذى.—In the second comma, either an א has been dropt out of the text before וְרָאִיתִּי, or וְרָאִיתִּי is to be considered as a passive verb; as it was by Sep. and Jerom. See the note below.

Ver. 22. *Is to them as the strength of the rhinoceros.* כְּתַעֲצָת רִמָּה—Sep. ὡς δόξα μακροκέρως αὐτῶν—Vulg. *cujus fortitudo similis est rhinocerotis*.—So also Gr. Ven. ὡς κεφαλή μακροκέρως αὐτῶν—and so equivalently Saadiaz, and Arab. Erp. at least if their رأس signify the rhinoceros. But this has been doubted by modern critics; who think that the Arab رأس, as well as the Heb. רִמָּה, denotes the antelope. Hence Michaëlis forms this version: *celeritas est illi ut gazellarum* §; on which let us hear Rosenmüller: "*Sed equidem fateor, mihi hanc*

* With whom, however, it is usual to change יְהוָה into אֱלֹהִים.
 wa. from this, no doubt, induced to render *an/cula testimonium meum*.

† The Latin translator of the Sam. text
 ‡ What was read by Sep. and Vulg. it
 is hard to say: the former having אֵין אֵין; the latter, *non est*. From their translating passively the וְרָאִיתִּי of the
 next comma, οὐδὲ ἐβήσεναι—*not v. dour*—it might seem that they considered וְרָאִיתִּי also as a passive. § But
 in his German version: "*sein lauf ist, wie der lauf des wilden stiers*"—Hezel: "*und stark ist es (das volk) wie ein*
wilder oche"—Dathe: *alacres sunt, inflat bubali*.

"imaginem non planè aptam videri. Hinc existimaverim רָמַח וְרִעַתָּה idem esse quod Arab. "אלרים elationem gazellarum, qua locutione Arabes utuntur, quando indicare volunt, "gazellas capite fursum elato arrectisque auribus adstare, id quod hæc animalia præ alacritate "solent facere. Sic pulchra imagine fititur populus Israeliticus, antea jacens et sub Ægypt-
 "tiorum servitute oppressus, nunc vero in libertatem assertus et in feliciorum statum evectus.
 "Hinc totum hunc versum malle vertere: *Deus hunc populum eduxit ex Ægypto: alacritas ei*
 "*est, ut gazellis.* Cæterum notandum, ex hac interpretatione vocem רִעַתָּה non esse referen-
 "dum ad radicem רָעָה, sed, admissâ metatthesi litterarum, ad Arab. رَفَعَ *ascendit, altus fuit.*"
 This is certainly specious, and even plausible: but I am unwilling to think, that the Septua-
 gint were here in the wrong.—Our common English version, which makes God have "the
 "strength of an unicorn," is properly corrected by Delgado into "he is unto them as it
 "were like the strength of an unicorn."—The other, he thinks, "favours of a profane speech."
 —He has likewise well corrected ver. 23. which in our public version runs thus: "Surely
 "there is no enchantment against Jacob, nor is there any divination against Israel: according
 "to this time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, What hath God wrought?"—Our
 elder translators more judiciously followed Sep. and Vulg. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ οὐρανοσκοπία ἐν Ἰακώβ, καὶ
 μαντικὴ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ—*Non est augurium in Jacob, nec divinatio in Israel:* both which versions per-
 fectly suit what follows: κατὰ καιρὸν ἐρρησεται Ἰακώβ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, τί ἐπιτελεσται ὁ Θεός—
 Vulg. *temporibus suis dicetur Jacob et Israel quid operatus (better operaturus) sit Deus.* The
 meaning is, that the Israelites have no need of omens, or divination: their God tells them
 occasionally, and at proper times, what is to befall them†.—It is matter of wonder that
 Houbigant, Michaëlis, and even Dathe, should adopt here the Syriac version, in opposition to
 all the others, save Saad.—The Gr. of Venice has well rendered the whole verse: Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ
 στοχαστὴς ἐν Ἰακώβ, οὐτε μαντικὴ ἐν Ἰσραὴλ: κατὰ καιρὸν ἐρρησεται τῷ Ἰακώβ, τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, τί ἐργασται
 ὁ Θεός.

C H A P. XXIV.

Ver. 6. *LIKE vales planted with groves.* The present text has כְּנַחֲלִים נָשָׂא: by Montanus rendered: *sicut torrentes extensa sunt:* scil. *tabernacula Israel*—by our English translators: "as
 "the valleys are they spread forth." The word נָחַל is ambiguous, signifying sometimes a *tor-*
rent, and sometimes the *vale* through which it passes. In the former meaning it was taken by
 Ouk. Tharg. Syr. and Gr. Ven.; in the latter, by Sep. Vulg. and, perhaps, both Arabs. This
 indeed seems to be the true meaning: for, what propriety would there be in likening the
 tents of Israel to *torrents*?—But what is the meaning of נָשָׂא? It is commonly rendered *ex-*
tended, spread forth, &c. But the reading of Sam. text is נָשָׂא†; and so seem to have read
 Sep. and Jerom. The version of the former is, ὡςτις νεκταὶ σπασσονται—of the latter, *ut vales*
nemorosa. This reading I have followed in my version.

* By Delgado corrected thus: "Surely there are no omens in Jacob, nor divinations in Israel: at all times it shall be
 "told unto Jacob and unto Israel what God is about to do." † "Israelites non sunt dediti auguriis, nec opus iis
 "habent." Rosenmüller. ‡ But 8 Sam. and 1 Heb. mss. have נָשָׂא; and this I deem a more probable reading
 than נָחַל. The metathesis was easily made. Yet still, with Houbigant, I prefer the textual reading of Sam.

Ib. *Like hygn-aloes*. Heb. עֲרֻמֹּת—Sep. ὄνυ σκηναι—Vulg. ut *tabernacula*—and so equivocally Syr. Saad. and Gr. Ven. But the parallelism seems to require something of the plant kind: and Onk. and Perf. so understood it. But what *plant* is here designated? Onkelos keeps to a general term אַרְבֻּצִּים, *aromatic plants*. The Perfic translator is more particular: he makes it the *sandal-wood*. Celsius* has made it probable, that it is the *hygn-aloe*; by the Greeks called ξυλαλον, and αγγαλλοχαι. See Explan. Note.

Ver. 7. The poet having before mentioned *water-streams*, is naturally led to another metaphor; namely, the sources from which they spring. I take עַל here to signify those sources, or source; and render it *an urn*. The Septuagint found the metaphor too harsh, and turned the phrase another way: Εξέλκεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ.—In the next comma, I suspect that the original reading was עֲמֻל, not עֲמֹל; a mark of which still remains in the version of Sep. who have εὐωνυ πολλῶν†.

Ib. *Their king shall be superior to Agag*: מֶלֶךְ מִנְּכַנּוּ מֶלֶךְ. But the Sam. reading is מֶלֶךְ; and so Sep.: although, for the rest, their text seems here to be corrupted. The Rom. ed. has ὑψωθήσεται ἡ Γαγ ‡ βασιλεῖα, to which the other editions add αὐτῶν. But this mends not much the matter. It was not the kingdom of Gog (or Agag) which was to be exalted; but the king of Israel. Hence I suspect that the original reading of Sep. was ὑψωθήσεται ἡ Γαγ βασιλεῖα αὐτῶν: taking η, without an aspirate, in the meaning of *quam, præ, super*; which it is well known to have. Cyprian found in his Italic version, *exaltabitur, tanquam Gog, regnum ejus*§.—Did the Sep. read מֶלֶךְ in the first comma as well as in the second? or did they consider מֶלֶךְ as equivalent to it?—However that be, the aspirate ḥ is a corruption: although Jerom || seems to have so read; if indeed his copy of Sep. had any aspirates.

Still it remains a question, which is the true original reading, *Gog* or *Agag*? If the reading in Montfaucon ascribed to Symmachus be really his, I should consider it as a strong corroboration of the Sam. and Septuagint. His version is, ὑψωθήσεται ὑπὲρ Γαγ βασιλεῖα αὐτῶν.—Michaëlis imagined that, although *Gog* be not the genuine reading, it leads to it. He would read מִנְּכַנּוּ; and thinks it may have been the same with *Ogyges*, who brought a colony of Phœnicians into Bœotia, and reigned at Thebes. But this is vague conjecture. Nor is it possible at this day to decide the point with certainty. Yet, comparing the passage with ver. 20, I am inclined to think that the king of the Amalekites is here intended.

Ver. 17. *A star traced from Jacob*. כֹּכַב מִיַּעֲקֹב. It is well known that *comets*, which were confounded with stars, were considered by the ancients as prognostic of great events, particularly of the birth of great kings. See Le Clerc *in loc.*

Ib. *Will consume the withers of Moab*. The Hebrew is מִן פְּתֵי מוֹאָב. The Sam. printed text has מִן, but 2 mss. read as Heb. And now for the meaning. Most of the ancients, after Sep. give to מִן the signification of *chiefs, princes*, or the like. They are supposed to

* Hierobot. p. 135, &c. † They took the preceding עַל for a verb, from עָלָא an arm, and render *supervent* in the sing.; although עֲמֹל be the antecedent: but they having before turned עֲמֹל into ἄνθρωπος, it was necessary to continue the same mode of construction. ‡ Compl. has Γαγ. § Apud Sabatier. || His version of Sep. is: *Et elevabitur Gog regnum ejus, et crescat regnum illius*. But the Hebrew (adds he) I found to run thus: *Tolleat proprietatem* (the present Vulg. has *propter*) *Agag rex ejus, et asforretur regnum illius*: on which his comment is: “*Ex quod regnum Israel in Saule, propter Agag regem Amaleck destructum sit.*” Comment. in Ezechiel, c. 38. tom. iii. p. 968. ed. Ben. A strange version, and a stranger comment!

have read פָּתַרְתִּי. But I am persuaded that פָּתַרְתִּי is the genuine reading, and to be taken here in the same sense as in Jeremiah 48. 45. where a very similar passage occurs: and in both places, it is my belief, the word signifies *whiskers*. Compare the Chald. and Syr. פָּתַרְתִּי—It is well known, that whiskers, in the East, were and still are deemed the greatest ornament of the face; and to destroy or disgrace them was considered as a most grievous affront. By giving this meaning to פָּתַרְתִּי the parallelism is evident, and the figure highly poetical. The comet is to burn the whiskers, the sceptre is to break the crown of Moab: I say *crown*, because I am persuaded that the Samaritan קָדַר is the genuine reading; and that both it and פָּתַרְתִּי are governed by the same verb פָּתַרְתִּי. I am even of opinion, that almost all the antient interpreters read קָדַר, although they took it to be a verb: for, how out of קָדַר*, the present Heb. reading, they could draw the idea of *sniting, domineering, subduing, &c.* I cannot possibly conceive; whereas all these meanings are found in the root קָדַר.

1b. *The sons of sedition.* The Heb. is בְּנֵי שֵׁט; in our common translation rendered "the children of Seth:" and so indeed most of the antient and modern versions.—But what, pray, has *Seth*, or *Sheth*, to do with Moab? I am convinced that שֵׁט here means *sedition, contempt, rebellion, &c.* See the root שָׁטָה, the Arab. شَتَا, the Sam. שִׁטָּה, the Æthiopic שְׁאָט, and the Chald. and Syr. שִׁטָּה; and comp. Jerem. in the verse already quoted; where he has שֵׁט instead of שֵׁט.—The Moabites were subdued by David, and made tributaries to Israel: but after the death of Ahab they rebelled; but were reconquered by the joint efforts of Joram and Josaphat, assisted by the king of Edom. Comp. 2 Sam. 8. 2. and 2 Kings 3. 4. to 24. But under the denomination of בְּנֵי שֵׁט, *sons of sedition*, may be designed every turbulent neighbour. See Explan. Note.

Ver. 19. *A prince descending from Jacob.* The text has only יוֹרֵד מִיַּעֲקֹב, by Montanus rendered, *Et dominabitur de Jacob*: by our English translators, "Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion†." I believe the Septuagint have perfectly well rendered the comma: Καὶ ἐξερχήσεται ἐκ Ιακώβ—So Onk. יוֹרֵד מִבֵּית יַעֲקֹב: *And one shall spring from the house of Jacob*—and Syr. וְיָרֵד מִן יַעֲקֹב: *Et descendet de Jacob*.—The Tharg. of Babylon has supplied the very word which I have used in my version: יוֹרֵד וְיָקִים שָׁלִים מִבֵּית יַעֲקֹב, *A prince shall descend, and arise from the house of Jacob*.—It is true that Jerom, Saadiah, and the other translators took יָרַד in the sense of *dominari*: and Dathe has followed them: *Tum dominabitur aliquis ex Jacobitis*. In my version I have conjoined both acceptations.

With respect to the next comma, וְהִמָּחֵר שְׂרִיד מֵעִיר, literally, *Et faciet-perdere reliquias ex civitate*; or, as Sep. καὶ ἀπολείψουσιν ἐκ πόλεως; the word עִיר is to be taken collectively, of all the cities that were depopulated by the kings of Israel or Judah. Some think it relates to the cities of Moab only, which had not been unpeopled by David, or even by Josaphat; and

* Some moderns, indeed, have imagined that an apposite meaning might be found in the Arab. קָדַר, which in the 2d conjugation (as they call it) denotes *to tax*—Others derive it from the Chald. קָדַר *glocitare*: "ut sensus sit (says Alting) congregabis glocitando inftar gallinæ fīne Seth!!"—Some derive it from קָדַר *a wall*: hence קָדַר is (e contrario) *to unwall*! Verschuur would derive it from the Arab. קָדַר *secare*; and this derivation is adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller.—How forced is all this, every discerning reader will, I apprehend, readily perceive. But, what miserable shifts have not been used, to save the integrity of the Masoretic text? † They here overlooked their usual Italic scrupulosity; according to which, they should have rendered: "Out of Jacob shall come he, that shall have dominion:"—

and, even then, they would not have been completely literal,

would refer it to the reign of Alexander Jannæus; in whose time Josephus says that a great number of cities were made dependent on Judæa*. But I cannot possibly subscribe to this hypothesis, which would naturally lead me to consider the Pentateuch-history as a much later compilation, than I can believe it to be. I think the *oracle* refers to the cruel victories of David, recorded in 2 Sam. chap. 8. above quoted, and in 1 Chron. 18. 2.

As this and the two preceding verses have been pretty generally supposed to relate to the MESSIAH, or CHRIST: I will here give my own opinion in the words of Dathe; with whom I perfectly agree: "Quamquam multi interpretes, antiquiores et recentiores, Judæi et Christiani, hoc vaticinium de MESSIA explicarunt; tamen contextus tam parum favet huic opinioni, ut mirum videatur, tam multos in errore adeo manifesto potuisse consentire. Nam præter *stellæ* et *sceptri* nomina, sub quibus regem intelligendum esse, dubio caret, nihil est in toto loco, quod ad Messiam possit transferri: immo, omnia reliqua contrarium docent. Dixerat Bileamus ver. 14. verbis minime obscuris Balako, velle se, antequam in patriam suam rediret, indicare, quid populus Israeliticus Moabitico, sequentibus temporibus, fit futurus. Jam præmissa carmini suo prophetico præfatione, ver. 15. et 16. qua jam antea usus fuerat ver. 3. et 4. dicit, regem aliquando insignem exiturum esse, qui Moabitas et Edomitas fit perditurus et destruciturus, &c. At, enimvero, qui possunt hæc, nisi perquam coacte, ad Messiae regnum pacificum, et generi humano salutare, transferri? Sed non opus est, ut hoc pluribus refutemus; partim quoniam quivis, qui non præconcepta opinione impeditus ad loci interpretationem accedit, sensum ejus facile potest investigare; partim quoniam illius explicationis errores satis demonstrati sunt et refutati ab interpretibus linguarum peritis, et a piis illis hypothesebus alienis."—He, in particular, refers his readers to Verschuir † and Michaëlis §; to whom I likewise beg leave to refer mine. The places are quoted below.

Ver. 21. *The Kenites.* There is a *paronomasia* in this and the next verse, that cannot be preserved in a translation. *Ken* is a *nest*, and the *Kenites* are *nestlers*: as if we were to say: "Looking towards the *Nestler*, he said: Although thy *nest* thou hast fixed in a rock;" as eagles, ravens, and other birds of prey are wont to do.—We come now to a very difficult passage indeed.

Ver. 22. *And the cunning of Ashur shall captive thee.* The present text is *וְעַד אֲשִׁירִי תִּשְׁבְּ*, *donec Ashur te captivet*; or, as our public version: "until Ashur shall carry thee away captive."—But what sense is there in this: "The Kenite shall be wasted, until Ashur carry thee away captive?" Besides that, *וְעַד* never signifies *until*. To say that *וְעַד* is here redundant, is to give us words without validity: not to mention that the verb is feminine, and the nominative masculine; for enallages of this kind are admitted. In short, the whole sentence,

* Κατὰ τούτων δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἦδη τῶν Συρίων, καὶ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ Φοινικῶν πόλεις εἶχον Ἰουδαῖοι: πρὸς θάλασσαν μὲν Στρατωνὸς πύργον, Ἀπολλωνίαν, Ἰωσὴν, Ἰαμνίαν, Ἀζωτὸν, Ταζαν, Ἀρθηδόνα, Ραφίαν, Ρινοκόλουραν· ἐν δὲ τῇ μεσσηγείᾳ, κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, Ἀβυρὰ, καὶ Μαρίσσαν, καὶ Σαμαρείαν, Καρμηλίον πρὸς καὶ Ἰταζυρίον πρὸς, Σκυθωπόλιν, Γαδάρα, Γαδανιτῖδα, Σελευσίαν Γαβλά, ΜΟΑΒΙΤΙΔΑΣ Ἐσσεῶν, Μηδαῖα, Λεμκά, Ορνας, Γελιδάνα, Ζαρά. x. v. l. Antiq. l. xiii. c. 15. No. 4. p. 674.

† The Jews, who expect a warlike and conquering Messiah, may with some degree of plausibility apply the pretended prophecy to HIM: but how a Christian ever could think of applying it to JESUS CHRIST, is, I confess, a wonderful thing.

‡ J. Henr. Verschuir *Dissertationes Philologico-ægeicæ*. Franquæ, 1773. dissert. 1.

§ Notes on his German version of the Bible. See also Rosenmüller *Scholia* in loc.

as it now stands, is, in my opinion, grossly ungrammatical, and void of meaning. Read then ערמה in one word, as it was read by Sep.; but render not as they have done*. For the rest, the terms קן, לבער, ערמה, are highly significative, and give a beautiful strain of poetical images. The Kenites, nestling in rocks, were not to be subdued by open violence, but by stratagem; perhaps by setting fire to their holds, as the word בער seems to imply. The Scotch reformer John Knox used a similar metaphor, when he destroyed the monasteries: "Burn the nests (said he), if ye wish the rooks not to build again."

Ver. 23. Of which the last member is thus written in the present Heb. text: וְאִי שֶׁנֶּשְׁמָה אֱלֹהִים: by Montanus rendered: *Vae! quis vivet a ponendo cum ista?* He considered אֱלֹהִים as a pronoun†, contrary to all the antients, who render it *God*, or some equivalent name.—Sep. Ω, ω! τις ζήσεται ὅταν θῇ ταῦτα ὁ Θεός?—Vulg. *Heu! quis victurus est, quando ista faciet Deus?* And so, equivalently, Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. who most literally renders: Αἰ! τις ζήσεται, ὅπου τὰν τέθειται ὁ Θεός?—Our vulgar English version: "Alas! who shall live, when God doeth this?" I cannot, however, believe this to be the meaning of the comma, although it has been adopted by most modern interpreters.—Some, indeed, have given a different turn to the sentence; taking נֶשְׁמָה to be from the root נָשַׁם, *desolari, vastare*; and render after Pagninus: "Who shall live, after God shall have destroyed him, or it?" So Le Clerc, and Houbigant, whose note is: "Sententia est: *Vae ei qui superstes erit, postquam rempublicam ejus Deus everterit. . . Agitur potissimum respublica Judæorum, ejus interitum Balaam sequenti versu denuntiatur.*"—Few critics, I think, will be pleased with this conceit. Whether my conceit will be more fortunate, I venture not to predict—but here it is.

In the first place, with Pagninus, Le Clerc, Michaëlis, I consider נֶשְׁמָה not as a part of the verb נֶשַׁם *ponere*, but of נָשַׁם *desolare*; and, as a noun, *desolatio, res stupenda*. I next consider נֶשַׁם and אֱלֹהִים as one word, נֶשְׁמָה אֱלֹהִים, *desolatio Dei*; or *desolatio maxima*, according to the oriental idiom. This נֶשְׁמָה, then, or נֶשְׁמָה (for it is all one whether the word be written with a *vau* or a *jod*), I take to be the dreadful wind called *simum, simiel*, and *simooly*; which is looked upon by the Arabs and other eastern nations as the most pestiferous and destructive that blows; and causing immediate death to those whom it encounters unprepared. Lying down flat on the ground is deemed the best method of avoiding the danger: but the attack is sometimes so sudden, as to leave no time for precaution. The effects are sometimes instantly fatal: the corpse becomes livid, as if blighted by lightning. At other times it produces putrid fevers, which in a few hours prove mortal.—Such was the account of it which Dr. Russell had from the Arabs of Aleppo.—At Aleppo, they, at present, write the word נֶשְׁמָה: but this, I apprehend, can be no great objection to my etymon. As early as the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, the letters *jamech, schin*, and *tsade* were in sound confounded: and

* Καὶ οὕτως γένηται τῷ Βαυρ νοστιὰ πανουργίας, Ἀσσυριοὶ ἀχμαλωτεύουσιν αὐ. They considered נֶשַׁם as a proper name; whereas it is a part of the verb נֶשַׁם: and they put נֶשַׁם in regimen with קן; whereas itself is the nominative of נֶשַׁם. Their version might be reformed thus: Ἀλλ' ὅπως νοστιὰ εἶσαι εἰς ναυτεῖν πανουργία τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἀχμαλωτεύουσιν αὐ.

† He deserted here his master Pagninus (whose version is, *Vae! quis vivet, postquam desolaverit cum Deus?*) to follow the bulk of Rabbins, who take אֱלֹהִים to be the same with נֶשְׁמָה. I know not if he has been followed by any more recent interpreters, beside Variable and Malvenda.

‡ It is remarkable that many MSS. and some of the more ancient editions read so; and one of De Rossi's (265) not only reads so, but notes, in the margin, that such is the reading in every correct copy, in omni codice correcto. See De Rossi.

it is well known that confusion of sound begets a new and different orthography; as might be shown by numerous examples. The *sumam*, *sumiel*, or *smooly* winds are most dreaded on the Bassora side of the Desert; which makes the application more forcible in the mouth of Balaam. Nothing, indeed, could be more appropriate to usher in what he had to say of the *Chetbites*, or *Greeks*, who, under Alexander, overthrew the Persian empire, with a rapidity and impetuosity equal to that of the *sumiel*.—If this explication of a very difficult passage be rejected by my brother-critics, I shall patiently wait for a more plausible one.

Ib. Or *protected from the band of the Chetbites*. The present text has יָמִים מִדְּכִתִּים; commonly rendered “and ships from the coast of Chittim.” It is generally allowed that this is one of the most obscure passages of the whole chapter; and various interpretations have been given of it, which the reader may see in Poole, Calmet, or Rosenmüller. I shall content myself with attempting to establish my own. In the first place, then, I conceive that the verses have been ill divided, and that the last comma of ver. 23. belongs to ver. 24. Secondly, I consider the meaning of that comma to be what I have rendered it: “who shall be preserved from the *sumiel*?” Thirdly, the true reading of the next comma, where we naturally expect a parallelism, I conceive to be יָמִים מִדְּכִתִּים, which is still the reading of 1 Sam. xix. and was that of Sep. and, probably, of Saadias: the former rendering καὶ ἐξέλκεται (read with Copt. ἐξέλκεσθαι) ἐκ χειρὸς (al. χειρῶν) Κιτιίων—the latter, חַדְרֵי מִן פְּרִצָה קְרִים.—One might imagine that it should be כִּתִּים, or כִּתִּי, rather than יָמִים; to correspond with יָמִים in the foregoing comma: but that consimilarity is not necessary: the numbers are frequently changed on such occasions; and the כִּ before יָמִים (or, as Sam. reads, יָמִים) is understood before יָמִים without any impropriety. The literal version would be: “Quis servabitur a *sumiel*? et qui exeuntes ex manu Chetheorum?” *Who shall escape from the band of the Chetbites?*—The meaning of the whole sentence, then, is: that it shall be as difficult to escape the power of the Chetbites, as it is to avoid the *sumiel* or *sumam*. This is, at least, all the meaning I can make out of it.

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 1. *THE people profaned themselves*: וְיָחַל הָעָם. The word יָחַל is commonly rendered *began*, according to the Masoretic punctuation: but, with Michaëlis and Delgado, I prefer the rendering of Sep. ἐξέλεσθη. This profanation was, most probably, committed at the annual feast of Baal-pheor; at which it is not unlikely that the women, in honour of that god, exposed themselves to be vitiated by the first offerer. We learn from Herodotus*, that this was customary at Babylon; and the same rite is alluded to in the Epistle of Jeremiah†.

Ver. 3. *Some of them even wore the badges of Baal-pheor*. Heb. וְיָחַל יִשְׂרָאֵל לְבַעַל-פְּעֹר; but Sam. has מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; and this is evidently a better reading. It was not all Israel that profaned themselves on this occasion; but only a part of them. For the rest, the word וְיָחַל, which is commonly rendered *was joined*, expresses more than that. It means, that they assumed the marks or badges of the profane deity, whom the Moabites adored. See the Arab. وَجَدَ—Sep. ἐτελεσθη—Vulg. *initiatum est*—Not badly Gr. Ven. Καὶ συνεπλάκη Ἰσραὴλος τῷ σέβασματι τοῦ Πρωτοῦ.

* Clio, c. 199.

† Baruch, ch. 6. ver. 43.

Ver. 4. *Take all the chiefs of the people with thee; and let them slay, &c.* According to the present Hebrew text; or, rather, according to the faulty versions that have been made from it, God is made to bid Moses *take and hang all the chiefs of the people!* which is repugnant to the very next verse, "If these words (says Kennicott) *קח את כל ראשי חזקת אמת* do not mean, that "Moses was to hang up all the people, they must mean all those who were *heads* or *judges* of the people. But neither were these *judges* to be hanged up; because, in the next verse, "Moses commanded those very judges to slay such of the people as had then been idolatrous. "The truth is, that some words have been omitted in the Sam. text, and some in the Heb. "and both together taken will complete the sense, thus: *And the Lord said unto Moses: SPEAK unto all the heads of the people, AND LET THEM SLAY THE MEN THAT WERE JOINED UNTO BAAL-PHOR; and hang them up,*" &c. So Kennicott, after Houbigant; whom I have followed in my version. Onkelos and both Thargums * understood, that Moses was to take the chiefs of the people, as judges of the case, to try and put to death those men, *חזקת אמת*, who had been guilty of profaning themselves†.

Ver. 6. *Approached to his brethren, with a Midianite woman.* *יקרב אל אחיו את חובבת.* But the Septuagint seem to have read *אל* where *אח* is, and *אח* where *אל* is: as they render, *και ιδου παραγωγις των υιων Ισραηλ, ελθων, προσεγγαγε τον αδελφον αυτου † προς την Μιδιανιτην* as if the transgressing Israelite had been led, by a procurer, to the tent of the Midianite woman: and this is in some sort justified by ver. 8. as we shall presently see. But the present Heb. text, which differs not here from Sam. will not readily admit such a rendering: although it is well known that *אל* and *אח* have been frequently interchanged by copyists; and seem sometimes to have nearly the same meaning. Jerom renders thus: *Et ecce unus de filiis Israel intravit, coram fratribus suis, ad seortum Madianitidem:* which appears to favour the Septuagint version; but which may also have been formed, by way of paraphrase, from the present Heb. The Syr. version is in the same predicament.

Ver. 8. *In the bedchamber.* Heb. *אל קברת*—Sam. *על קברת*—by Sep. rendered *δια της μητρος αυτης*—Vulg. *in locis genitalibus*—Onk. *למטה*—and so equivalently all the versions down to Gr. Ven. which hath *προς τη κοστει ταυτης*—and similarly all the modern translations, even Houbigant, Dathe, Michaëlis§, Schulz, Rosenmüller, &c.—Yet I am fully persuaded that this is not the meaning; whether we read *אל קברת* or *על קברת*. I believe, with Delgado, that *קברת* here is to be taken in the same sense as *קבר* in the former comma; and means the *alcove* ||, or *recess* in the tent, where the crime was committed. Delgado's remark is worthy of observation: "*Kobabab* must mean her tent, not her belly. It is true, that *קבר* *kebab* means the stomach: "but then, to express her stomach, it should be *kebabab*. Besides, it ought to be expressed

* The Bab. Tharg. paraphrases thus: "The Lord said to Moses: Take all the chiefs of the people, and appoint them judges, and let them give judgment against those who are to be slain, &c." And so equivalently Jerus.

† I find the following explication in Secker's ms.: "Take the magistrates to attend and assist thee, and hang the offenders. *קרב* is used in an honourable sense ch. 27. 10, 22." ‡ The word *אח*, like *אח*, may be in the sing. or plur. They considered it as a singular; and so it was taken by Gr. Ven. § He leaves, indeed, the word untranslated; because, as he tells us in his note, German delicacy would not allow him to name its equivalent. "Was hier hehet, nemlich der ort, wo die eine person verwundet, war, lässt sich im Deutscher, nach dem wohlstand unserer sprache, nicht nennen."

|| This, indeed, is the same word, with an Arab. prefix. In Spanish, *alcoba*; and sometimes *alcova*.

"the plains of Moab, which are by the Jordan of Jericho : and Moses numbered them from twenty years, upward, as the Lord had given in command to Moses." This version is also consistent ; but, still, it is not conform to the original.—The other versions are more literal, but for that reason unintelligible.

Have our modern interpreters better succeeded ? Houbigant would make two supplements ; one after **למסר**, thus : **שמו את רשם**, *take up the sum* ; the other after **ומעלה**, thus : **ומעשו**, *and they did so*.—"Or, if **ומעשו** be not added (says he), **למסר** must be expunged ; and **שמו את רשם**, *and they took up the sum of them*, put in its stead."

Michaëlis would, with Syr. supply **יספר** after **ירדו** : although in his German version* he has not followed that emendation.

Dathe's version is : "Moses igitur et Eleasar sacerdos hoc eis promulgârunt in campestribus Moabiticis juxta Jordanem e regione Hierichuntis : atque numerum inierunt eorum qui annum vicessimum excefferant, quemadmodum Jova Mosi præceperat et Israelitis, cum ex Ægypto essent egressi." He omits (rightly, I think) the word **למסר**, and repeats, with Houbigant, **ושמו את רשם** ; but doubts whether the last part of ver. 4. should be connected with what precedes, or with what follows. I wonder he had any doubt on this head : but the Masoretic division, it appears, had some weight with him on this occasion.

Rosenmüller, who hesitates between Dathe and Houbigant, adds : "Quidquid statuas, hoc saltem certum est, locum hunc esse adfectum, qui opem criticam adhuc expectat."—Whether this expectation will be answered by what I am going to say, it would be presumption in me to affirm : but I am inclined to believe that my correction and explication of the text are the most plausible that have yet been made. First of all, I throw out **למסר**, as evidently an intruder, although a very early one. It was, probably, introduced by some ignorant copyist, who understood not the meaning of **דבר**, and thought it must be followed by a **למסר**, as in ver. 1. 2dly, I think **דבר** here does not signify *to speak*, but *to count, sum up, tell over* ; which meaning it still plainly retains in Arabic ; and there are evident traces of it in Chald. and Syr. : see the Arab. **دبر**, and the various meanings of the Chald. and Syr. **דבר** in Castell. It may be worthy of remark, that the phrase here is not **ידבר אליהם**, but **ידבר אותם**. I know that the particle **אם**, or **את**, has sometimes after the verb **דבר** the same meaning as **אל** ; but still this is not the common form ; and the other much more common one could not have been used here, in the supposition that the meaning of **ידבר** is such as I have given to it.—*Id viderint acutiores.*

Ver. 10, 11. It is the remark of Secker (MS. Notes), that the text here seems to contradict chap. 16. ver. 27 and 32. And Whiston, before him, had justly observed, that "we have in the book of Numbers a very particular account of the destruction of the seditious Reubenites Dathan, Abiram, and their partners ; with Korah and his two hundred and fifty Levites : of the Reubenites, *by the earth swallowing them up* ; of the Levites, *by fire* : but what Korah himself died of is not directly told us in our present Heb. and Greek Bibles. [He might have added all the other versions.] It rather seems by them, that he was *swallowed up*, than that

* "Die machte Mose und der priesler Eleasar in den Moabitischen gefilden am Jordan Jericho gegen über bekannt, und sagten : ihr sollt von zwanzig iahren an und darüber gezählt werden, wie Jehova schon ehedem Mose und den Israeliten nach dem aufzuge aus Ægypten befohlen hat." An odd translation, it must be confessed.

"he was *burnt*, contrary to the reason of the thing itself; which would rather require, that Korah, the head of the Levites that burned incense, should perish with those who burned incense with him; as Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up with the other Reubenites. Now, here we have both the Sam. Pentateuch and Josephus, as authentic witnesses that the original Hebrew asserted, that Korah was *burnt with his Levites*: and in effect the Psalmist's testimony also*, who mentions only Dathan and Abiram as *swallowed up*, and not burnt. Also we have the testimony of the *Apostolical Constitutions* †; and in effect of Clement of Rome, of Ignatius and Eusebius, that the Septuagint version originally gave the same account. So that here we have a clear instance of the alteration of both the Heb. and Gr. copies of the Old Testament, since the first century ‡." Clear as this instance appeared to Whiston, posterior critics, even Houbigant §, Michaëlis, Dathe, Rosenmüller, Hezel, &c. saw it not in that light. They make Korah die with Dathan and Abiram. But whoever has carefully compared verses 6, 16, and 19, of chap. 16. with the present passage, must, I think, be of Whiston's opinion; and be thankful that the Samaritan text has preserved the true reading.—It is but fair, however, to state one objection that may be made from chap. 16. ver. 24. where the Lord bids Moses desire the people to "depart from about the abode, *בְּתוֹךְ*, of KORAH, Dathan and Abiram." Here the abode of Korah is mentioned, as to be swallowed up, as well as the abodes, or tents, of Dathan and Abiram: and in ver. 27. the people "departed, on every side, from about the abodes of *קֹרַח*, Dathan and Abiram." How would I reconcile this? I would either say, that the word *Korah* is in both places an interpolation, which I am not a little inclined to do; or that the tent of Korah, although it contained not himself, contained his seditious retainers; and was on that account ingulphed in the fate of the other rebels. It is not said that Korah was in his tent; or stood at the door of his tent, as did Dathan and Abiram: ver. 28. Nor is it said in ver. 12. that Moses sent for Korah; but only for Dathan and Abiram: nor in ver. 25. that Moses went to Korah; but only to Dathan and Abiram: whereas, on the other hand, it is clear from ver. 16, 17. and 19. that Korah was present at the head of the Levites who offered incense at the door of the convention-tent; and was consequently among those whom fire devoured; and not among those whom the earth swallowed up. How his sons escaped, as is said chap. 26. ver. 11. or where they were when the calamity happened, the Historian gives us leave to conjecture the best we can. They most probably had, against their father, sided with Aaron; and had, previously to the opening of the earth, left their father's tent, if it was among those that were swallowed up:—which, as I have already hinted, may admit a doubt.—I have only to add, that a small transposition in the present Heb. text will make it correspond with the Sam. copy; although *וְהָיָה* be not repeated in ver. 10.

* Ps. 106. 17.

† Which Whiston believed to be canonical scripture.

‡ See Essay on the true Text

of the Old Testament, p. 64. or Kennicott's Rem. p. 70.

§ "Rectè *devoravitque eos et Coré*. Sed Samaritani

"*iterant וְהָיָה terra*, ubi nunc legitur *וְהָיָה terra*, quæ ultima verba rejiciunt post *וְהָיָה*, tanquam diceret Moses: *cum*

"*devoraret ignis Coré et ducentos quinquaginta*. Malè id quidem. Neque enim Coré igne absumptus fuit, sed terra

"*hiatu dehiscens*, et ante periit Coré, quam igne absumerentur cæteri ducenti quinquaginta." This was to have been

proved.

I subjoin the comparative numbers of this and a prior muster in Num. i.

Tribes.	Prior Muster.	Present Muster.		
REUBEN . . .	46500 . .	43730 . .	Diminished . .	2770
SIMEON . . .	59300 . .	22200 . .	Diminished . .	37100
GAD . . .	45650 . .	40500 . .	Diminished . .	5150
JUDAH . . .	74600 . .	76500 . .	Increased . .	1900
ISSACHAR . . .	54400 . .	64300 . .	Increased . .	9900
ZEBULON . . .	57400 . .	60500 . .	Increased . .	3100
EPHRAIM . . .	40500 . .	32500 . .	Diminished . .	8000
MANASSEH . . .	32200 . .	52700 . .	Increased . .	20500
BENJAMIN . . .	35400 . .	45600 . .	Increased . .	10200
DAN . . .	62700 . .	64400 . .	Increased . .	1700
ASHER . . .	41500 . .	53400 . .	Increased . .	11900
NAPHTHALI . . .	53400 . .	45400 . .	Diminished . .	8000
Total . .	603550 . .	601730 . .	Diminished . . .	1820

The LEVITES, now numbered, were 2300; by which it appears, that since their prior muster chap. 3. 42. they had increased only 627.

Ver. 59. *Whom Asa bare to him in Egypt.* With Michaëlis, I take *אשר* to be a proper name, the mother of Jochabed. Those who follow the present Hebrew punctuation are obliged to supply something; as our English translators have done: "the daughter of Levi, whom *her* mother bare to Levi in Egypt." Others supply *his wife* *. The Septuagint seem to have read *אשר*, referring it to the posterity of Levi in the following verse. The Latin Vulg.† Onk. Syr. Saad. took *אשר* to be in the passive voice; and either read not *אשר*, or disregarded it: or, perhaps they considered it as a nominative. The other ant. versions follow the present Heb.: as specimens, take Gr. Ven. *ἡ ἐκ τῆς αἰγύπτου λευίτις*: and Arab. Erp. *אשר ודורו ללוי*. Against the natural and easy reading of Michaëlis I can see only one objection; namely, that it makes Jochabed the immediate daughter of Levi, and consequently the aunt of her husband Amram. But if she were born toward the end of Levi's life, she might be as young as, or even younger than, Amram; and might be at the same time his aunt and his wife. We have seen aunts and uncles several years younger than their nephews and nieces.

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 3. *FOR his own sin only did our father die.* The words *our father* are in the Sam. only, and may possibly be an interpolation: but the phrase is so idiomatically pleonastic, that I can hardly not believe it a genuine reading. It ought not however to be concealed, that great

* So Dathe, *uxor ejus*: yet he allows that this is a harsh ellipsis: "Ellipsis nominis uxoris dura est, et integra formula contra usum loquendi in hujusmodi genealogiis."

† *Que nata est ei in Egypto*; followed by Luther, Munster, Castilio, Houbigant; and by our Coverdale and Bate.

critics are of a different opinion; nay, who think that the words in question are not even to be understood. They suppose, that it is not Zalaphahad who is here said to have died in his own sin; but Korah, who is mentioned immediately before. Among these critics is Rosenmüller. "Rectius, sine dubio, verba כִּי בַמִּדְבָּרָא אֲדָמָה ad Korachum, subjectum proximè antecedens, referuntur; ut sensus sit: Pater noster mortuus est in Deserto, filiis non relictis; neque tamen fuit inter eos qui contra Jehovam rebellaverunt cum Koracho, qui ob peccatum suum mortuus est." This is plausible; and the text, I think, will absolutely bear such a meaning: but the *sine dubio* is too strong; and I am rather inclined to think with Dathe, that the sin here mentioned is to be referred to Zalaphahad: "scilicet commune illud (peccatum) omnibus Israelitis, qui, propter incredulitatem, intra 40 annos in Deserto mortui sunt."—If the Sam. lection be admitted, it totally excludes any other meaning.

Ver. 14. The addition which I have here inserted from Sam. is at present placed in that copy after ver. 13. of chap. 20. I have thence transferred it hither, as to what I take to be its proper place. The different readings which occur in the Heb. and the versions are to be found in P. P. Deut. 3. 23—28.

Ib. *O Lord, God.* The Heb. text in Deut. and the Sam. in both places have אֲנִי יְהוָה; but all the antient interpreters, save Gr. Ven. seem to have read אֲנִי יְהוָה; which is the reading of two of Kennicott's mss.—Another ms. has only אֲנִי—another, both readings together, אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה—and another, אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה. In my version I have followed the reading of the antients.

Ver. 21. *By means of the urim.* אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲנִי יְהוָה—Sep. τη κριση των δηλων—and, what I did not expect, the Greek of Venice has a similar rendering, εν κρισει των φωτισμων—And, indeed, almost all the other antient translators seem to have considered אֲנִי as an appellative, denoting either *illumination*, or *manifestation*, or *declaration*—Vulg. omits it altogether; having only *consult Dominum*—Tharg. and Pers. retain the Heb. word; which, with our common version, I have also done. See Rem. on Exod. 28. 30.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Ver. 2. *MY fire-feeding oblations:* לֶחֶם לֵאֱכֹל: by our translators rendered, "my bread for my sacrifices made by fire." But לֶחֶם here means not *bread*; but the victims, or other offerings, that were thrown into the altar-fire to feed it.

CHAP. XXIX.

Ver. 1. SEE Levit. 23. 24. This expiation-fast, of the 10th of Tifri, (September 23d) is at Aleppo kept by the Jews with the greatest punctuality. It is a fast of twenty-four hours complete; and women with child, or sick persons, who are exempt on other occasions, will hardly accept of a dispensation on this day. They call it in Arabic צוֹם כִּיבּוֹר; by the Jews expressed צוֹם כִּיפּוּר. See Ruffel's *Aleppo*.

"est. Sed familia exempla occurrunt in historia barbara. Sic apud Tacitum, l. xiii. c. 39. "Corbulo castellum quoddam Parthicum cepisse narratur, nullo milite amisso, trucidatis vero omnibus, qui illud defenderent. Et apud Strabonem, l. xvi. p. 1128. describitur prælium in quo mille Arabes, et ~~duo~~ duntaxat Romani, occisi sunt. Accidebat fortasse quod Midianitæ non bellicosi erant, et ex insidiis oppressi." There was no need of a *fortasse*: it is clear from what is reported of the Midianites in the book of Numbers, that they were an effeminate, unwarlike nation. If they had been a nation of soldiers, they would not have sent for a soothsayer to curse their enemies. The conquest of such a people must have been easily obtained.

Ver. 50. *Bracelets, wristlets, &c.* I will not pretend to say that these English names are strictly equivalent to the Hebrew words, which are חֲסִידִים—צִנֹּת—מַכְבֵּשׁ—עֵלֶל—כֶּסֶם—by Sep. rendered χλιδωναι—ψελλίων—δακτυλίων—περιδέρειον—εμπλοκίων*—by Vulg. *periscelides—armillas—annulos—dextralia—muremulas*.—After comparing the versions, and tracing the words throughout the various dialects, I have given to each that meaning, which seemed to me the most probable. Our common version has *chains—bracelets—rings—ear-rings—tablets*—Dathē: *armillas—torques—annulos—inaures—globulos*—Michaëlis: "armbänder—håndbänder—ringe—"ohrengehänge—guldene kugeln."

C H A P. XXXII.

Ver. 1. *PLACES fit for cattle.* The whole region between Gilcad and the Euphrates was a sort of common, exceedingly fit for pasturage. No wonder then that the Reubenites and Gadites, who had a very great number of cattle, particularly of sheep and goats, desired to fix their residence in that land.

Ver. 3. *Beon.* We meet with this name in all the following forms: בְּעוֹן—בְּעֵל־בְּעוֹן—בֵּית־בְּעֵל־בְּעוֹן—and בֵּית־בְּעוֹן. The *mem* and *bet* have been often interchanged in Hebrew names; from their being both labial letters.

Ver. 12. *The Kenazite:* קְנָזִי. In the genealogy from Judah, 1 Chron. 4. 13. we are told that *Kenaz* was the father of *Othniel* and *Zeraiah*; but it is nowhere said whose son he was himself. In Josh. 15. 17. *Othniel* is called the son of *Kenaz* and the brother of *Chaleb*; and in Judges 1. 13. he is called *Chaleb's younger brother*: and in the passage now before us *Chaleb* is indeed called *the Kenazite*; but his father is both here and elsewhere called *Jephuneh*. In 1 Chron. 4. 15. *Kenaz* is said to be the son of *Elah*, and grandson of *Jephuneh*. These are all the *Kenazes* belonging to the tribe of Judah. We read of another *Kenaz* in Gen. 36. 11. but he was the son of *Eliphaz*, a descendant from *Esau*.—In this obscurity we must grope our way: I am however led to think, that *the Kenazite* is an epithet applied to *Jephuneh*; whose name denotes celebrity: *perclarus—conspicuous—respectable*. The word קְנָז exists not in Hebrew as an appellative noun or verb; but in Arab. it denotes an *innocent, innoxious* man: which was probably the character of *Jephuneh*; and hence his children were called the sons of *the Kenazite*; or simply *Kenezites*; as the posterity of *Rechab*, the father of *Jonadab*, were denominated the *Rechabites*.—This is the most which I can make of the matter.

* Perhaps the reader will be pleased to see how they are rendered by Gr. Ven. ψελλίων—χαριδα—δακτυλούς—ελλο-
τίον—μυροπορφυ. See, on the meaning of this last term, the Rem. on Exod. 35. 22. p. 302.

Ver. 23. I have said in Explan. Note, that the Septuagint seem to have had before them a different reading. Their version is: *γινασθε την ἀμαρταν ὑμῶν, όταν ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ τα κακά.*

Ver. 31.* *What the Lord hath ordained:* *אֵת אֲשֶׁר דָּבַר יְהוָה*—But two mss. have *אֵת כָּל אֲשֶׁר*, *whatsoever*—and Vulg. Syr. one of De Roffi's Chald. mss. and even Gr. Ven. (*καθ' ὅσον*) seem to have read *כֹּל אֲשֶׁר* without *אֵת*. With these De Roffi classes Sep. but this is a mistake: their reading is *ὅσον*, not *ὅπως*. The meaning is all the same, in either of the readings.

Ver. 38. *Baal-meon (its name being changed)*. The name of *Baal-meon* seems to have been changed on account of *Baal's* being the common name of the principal divinity worshipped in those countries. It was probably changed into *Beon*, as before remarked. Yet the former name, and indeed most other names changed by them, still held their ground: as is usual in other countries; where the more antient names of mountains, rivers, and cities are hard to be displaced. Some modern critics think that *מִסְכַּת שֶׁם* (*its name being changed*) is an interpolation. Others imagine, that it relates not only to *Baal-meon*, but to all the other cities here mentioned: that is, that the names of them all were changed by the Israelites. This is not warranted by the text.

C H A P. XXXIII.

WE are not to imagine, that all the stations and encampments of the Israelites, during forty years, are here particularly enumerated. Those places seem only to be mentioned where they resided some considerable time; whence, as from a centre, they made occasional excursions, for the sake of feeding their flocks, and other domestic avocations†. Compare the 13th, 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of Exodus.

Ver. 33. *Mount Gadgada*. The present Heb. has *וְהָרַר דִּגְדָּגָד*: by our translators rendered "Hor-hagidat." But the Sam. text and version, with 7 Heb. mss. and at first 4 more‡, have *וְהָרַר* instead of *וְהָרַר*; and so read Sep. *εἰς τὸς ὄρος Γαδγὰδ*—So also Vulg. *in montem Gadgad*. The others read *וְהָרַר*; if Gr. Ven. be not an exception: his rendering is *εἰς ὄρος Γαδγὰδου*. I have, with Houbigant, adopted the other reading; and, moreover, read with Sam. *וְהָרַר דִּגְדָּגָד*, instead of *וְהָרַר*.

C H A P. XXXV.

Ver. 5. ALTHOUGH I have endeavoured to explain this verse by means of a diagram, I will not say that I am certain of being altogether right. Houbigant has given a very different plan; and Delgado, one that differs from both: which the curious reader may compare with mine, and give the preference to that which best pleases him. I find, Michaëlis's general dimensions are the same with mine.

Ver. 12. *From the blood-avenger*. *גֹּאֵל*. Volumes have been written on this single word *גֹּאֵל* or *גֹּאֵל*, *GOEL*: yet its precise meaning has not yet been well ascertained. By Sep. it is rendered *ἀρχισυνάγωγος τοῦ αἵματος*—by Vulg. *cognatus occisi*.—Michaëlis thinks that the original meaning

of

* In Ver. Read. wrongly marked 32. † Take as an instance what is related in ver. 36. that "from Ebrona they marched to Raion-gaber:"—by far too great a distance for one day's march. To try to trace those marches and stations, then, by the modern marches of the caravans, would be labour in vain. ‡ One of De Roffi's Chald. mss. has the same reading: and Tharg. has an equivalent one. § They probably read *וְהָרַר דִּגְדָּגָד*, as it is written in

of the word **נָמַל** is *to contaminate*; and that **נָמָל** signifies one *contaminated with blood*; a *blood-stained* person. I think quite the contrary; namely, that *to contaminate* is only a secondary meaning of **נָמַל**.—According to others, the proper meaning of **נָמַל** is *obire, peragraré; to live as a Bedouin*; and thence contract their habits—one of which was, to *avenge* the blood of a near relation. But this is a round about etymon indeed, and even less admissible than that of Michaëlis. I am of opinion that the primitive meaning of **נָמַל** is *to profess*. See the Arab. **نَمَل** and the Syr. **ܢܡܠ** under the root **נָמַל**. Thence all the other significations are readily derived. Saadias seems to have understood the word **נָמָל** in this sense; as he renders **נָמָל** **נָמָל**.

From Pausanias and from Homer we learn, that, among the Greeks, the next relations of the murdered had a right to claim revenge: so that it was not an usage peculiar to the Jews, Arabs, and other eastern nations. The custom was, no doubt, established long before Moses; and was probably coeval with man in society. It was wise, however, in Moses to abate its ferocity, as much as possible, by giving temporary asylums to the guilty person, from the immediate pursuit and warm resentment of the *avenger of blood*, or **נָמָל**.

Ver. 25. *Who hath been anointed with the holy oil.* Delgado blames our translator for rendering **נָמַל** passively; and makes the congregation **וְהָעֵדָה** its antecedent. But beside that **נָמַל** is feminine, it was not certainly the congregation that anointed the high-priest. The verb **נָמַל** is an *impersonal*, as **נָמַל** is in ver. 30; and as many other verbs throughout the Hebrew writings. Our translators then did well to render passively, after almost all the antients; as our language rarely admits impersonal verbs. The French would say: *qu'on avoit oint*. The Septuagint seem to have read **נָמַל**, as they render *ὁ ἐξερῶν αὐτοῦ*: but perhaps they only thus hellenized the Hebr. impersonal; as they do on some other occasions. The Sam. copies have, in this verse, **וְהָעֵדָה** instead of **וְהָעֵדָה**; but all the antients seem to have read as Heb. The distinction in Sep. is obvious. They render **נָמַל** by *μεταξας*, but **נָמַל** by *φανερωται*.

Ver. 31. *For a man-slayer who hath been found guilty of murder, ye shall accept of no atonement.* Atonement here is equivalent to *ransom*; and the Hebrew Legislator very justly reprobates, and forbids, so unworthy a traffic: which, most probably, was not uncommon before his days.

The law of Mohammed, with respect to avenging blood, is this: "If any one be unjustly smitten, we give to his heir the right of demanding satisfaction: but he must not put the murderer to death in a *cruel* manner; nor avenge the blood of his relation upon any other person than the murderer*." All the Arabs, however, mind not this last caution. If they cannot find the murderer himself, they make reprisals on his next of kin, or perhaps on the chief of his family. In some places, a ransom is accepted: but the Arabs of Theman deem it a base thing in the *Goel*, or blood-avenger, to remit the murder of a relation for money. See Niebuhr's Description of Arabia, vol. i. p. 28—31. of the French edition.

Ver. 32. I have inserted the word *high* before *priest*, on the authority of all the Sam. copies, Sep. Syr. Vulg. and one of Kennicott's mss. which has **הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל**. I have joined Vulg. to the other versions, because, although he has not *sacerdos magnus*, he has its equivalent *pontifex*.

ver. 21. and as it was at first written here in the margin of one ms. and appears to have been effaced in other two. It seems also to have been read by Onk. and Syr. the former of whom has **כִּנְיָאֵל וְנָמָל**, the latter **כִּנְיָאֵל וְנָמָל**.

* Koran. sur. ii. 173.

CHAP. XXXVI.

Ver. 3, 4. DELGADO is surpris'd that our English translators should add the word *received* in these two verses, without putting it in Italics. It is certainly contrary to their usual scrupulosity: but surely they were not much to blame for this. Perhaps, they would have done better to follow Sep. *δὲ αὐ γίνονται γυναικες*. At any rate, Delgado had no reason to complain of them, since in their marginal reading they have literally followed the Heb. *unto whom they shall be*.—I have said in my Explan. Note, that most of the versions of ver. 4. are hardly intelligible. That of our common translation is: "And when the jubile of the children of Israel shall be, then shall their inheritance be put into the inheritance of the tribe wherunto they are received: so shall their inheritance be taken away from the inheritance of the tribe of our fathers." The meaning of which, if it have any, must be, that the inheritance of Zalaphabad's daughters would be "put to the inheritance" of some other tribe, only when the jubilee-year should arrive: which certainly cannot be the meaning of the text.—Houbigant understood his text, and has not badly rendered it: "Et, jubilæo filiis Israël adveniente, *manebit ipsarum hæreditas adjuncta ad eam tribum, ad quam se contulerint*." His version would have been clearer thus: "Et, vel etiam jubilæo filiis Israël," &c. I wonder that Michaëlis and Dathe did not attend to this. It was attended to by Rosenmüller, whose scholium is: "Sensus est: *etiamfi futurus est annus jubilæus, nihilominus tamen manebit hæreditas illarum penes alios*."—Of the ant. versions, the Septuagint at least, I think, admits this meaning.

Ver. 11. The order of the names of Zalaphabad's daughters is in Sep. Vat. thus: *Θερα, Εγλα, Μαλχα, Νουα, Μαλαα*. And so the Coptic version. But the other editions and the Glasg. ms. follow the order of Heb.

1b. *Paternal cousins*. לבני דדי—Sep. *τοὺς ἀνεψίους αὐτοῦ*—Vulg. *filii patris sui*.—Dathe, *patruilibus suis*.

DEUTERONOMY. CHAP. I.

Ver. 1. **O**N the other side of the Jordan—בעבר ודן—Sep. *παρὰ τοῦ Ιορδάνου*—Vulg. *trans Jordanem*—Onk. בעברא וירדנא—and so equivalently the other versions*, even Gr. Ven. which has *αὐτὰς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Ιορδάνου*. So also our first translators Coverdale, Matthew, Cranmer, Bishops. But our last translators, following the Genevans, changed the "other side" into "this side:" and so most moderns; fearing that, if the word were rendered otherwise, it would be considered as a proof that Moses was not the writer of this narrative. Is this an honourable way to obviate objections? In my opinion, the word בעבר, here, is one strong proof that the writer lived on the west side of the Jordan, and consequently could not be Moses. But

* Those who translated the Syr. and Tharg. in Pol. make them both say "on this side," *cū* or *citra*: but the original words are בעברא and בעברא; which why they should be rendered *on this side*, I should like to see some good reason adduced.

more of this in its proper place. Meanwhile, I content myself with saying, that I believe a single fair example cannot be produced, where עבר or בעבר signifies *on this side*.

1b. *Over against Suph*. Not, as in our common version, "the Red Sea;" from which the plains of Moab were at too great a distance, to be said to be "over against it." I take the סוף here to be the same with the סוף of 1 Sam. 9. 6. over against which, but on the other side of the river, Moses delivered to his Israelites the *Deuteronomy*, or a rehearsal of his preceding laws.—Hence the Jews call it סנה ודורה, or REPETITION OF THE LAW*.

Ver. 3. *Rehearsed to the children of Israel*. We are not to suppose that the words of Moses were actually addressed to all the Israelites. They were immediately addressed only to the chiefs of the people, to the senate or elders: but they are said to be spoken to all the people, because the injunctions concerned them all.—The whole address of Moses is one of the most beautiful that ever were uttered by human lips. The wisdom, the modesty, the persuasive eloquence and the paternal solicitude of the legislator are conspicuous throughout, and capable of touching the most obdurate hearts. Yet, how little regarded his precepts were in after-times, the series of Hebrew history will teach us.

Ver. 5. *Was Moses pleased*. ודחל משה. The antients seem to have read ודחל, *he began*. So Sep. ודחל—Vulg. *capit*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. שון—Saad. ודחל—But Arab. Erp. Perf. and Gr. Ven. have much better rendered the original by ודחל—βουλομαι—all terms perfectly equivalent to the Heb. ודחל. Delgado, then, did well to correct our public version here, by changing *began* into *was willing*; although this latter term is not the most proper one.—Better Houbigant, *visum fuit Moyse*.

Ver. 18. *At the same time I instructed you*. I have said in *Explan. Note*, that I suspected the true reading to be THEM; namely, the *Judges*. But all the copies have either אלהם or אליכם: and all the versions down to Gr. Ven. render in the second person. I have also said, that perhaps the instructions here alluded to may be the Decalogue: and so, I find, the Thargumists understood it: עשרת פרינטיא.

Ver. 32. *And are ye, &c.* I have translated this passage interrogatively; referring the words ברבר to the *matter* then in question; and as making a part of Moses's speech to the Israelites at the time of their rebellion, after the return of the spies. So Saadiah. And 5 Sam. mss. have the interrogation ה before ברבר. The referring of this and the next verse to the period in which Moses now speaks, or rather repeats what he had said before, is contrary to sense, analogy, and construction. Yet I do not find that it has been noticed by any modern critic.

Ver. 39. *Who as yet know not good nor evil*. It is well remarked by Secker, that our common version is here faulty: "which in THAT day," &c. against all the antient versions †.

Ver. 41. *Ye were ready*. ודחל. It is not easy to analyse this word, which occurs but once in the Hebrew Scriptures. There is some variety of reading in the mss. but of small or no

* From Deut. 17. 18. where the same words occur. † Sep. οἱ μαρτυροῦντες—Vulg. *hodie*—Onk. and Tharg. היום—Syr. היום—Both Arabs. היום—Perf. היום—Gr. Ven. οἱ μαρτυροῦντες—And so indeed equivalently all the foreign modern translators from Pagninus downward; with our own Bate and Purver: the former of whom has: "who know not as yet good or evil:" the latter: "who now know not either good or evil."—I wonder that Delgado did not correct this mistake in our common version.

importance. The antient interpreters vary. Sep. *סאבבסבסבס*—Vulg. *parati*—Onk. and Tharg. שרתן or שרתן—Syr. *אנחיתן*—Saad. *באדרתן*—Exp. *בדחתן*—Gr. Ven. *επαραισται*.—Some modern critics derive the Heb. word from the Arabic *فان*, *facilis esse*; and in some of its inflections *vilipendere*. Hence they bring a double explication of *תרדנו*; the one, *faciles vos praeiustis*; the other, *despexistis*: i. e. *rem nullius negotii putastis montem ascendere*. So Dathe: but Michaelis and Rosenmüller, who consider the meaning of *רן* to be simply *contemnere*, supply *monitum Domini*: as if Moses had said: “But ye despised the Lord’s admonition, and would go up to the mountain.”—But such an ellipsis, in my opinion, is here totally inadmissible.—Dathe’s hypothesis is far more specious; but I cannot think that he has hit upon the true derivation. I am inclined to believe, with the Rabbins Kimhi, Rashi, and Aben-Ezrah, that *תרדנו* is a fictitious verb from *רע* *ecce*. In Numb. 14. 40. where the same story is related, the people are made to say: *רענו*: “Lo, here we are.” Moses, in rehearsing this in Deuteronomy, turns their exclamation into a verb, *תרדנו*; as if we were to say: *Ye lo-here-we-are’d it*: just as we say of a song, or piece of music: *They encored it*. Nay, I have heard it said of a popular toast, that *they three-times-threed it*. Such compositions, I believe, will be found in most languages.

Ver. 44. *By Seir*. *בשער*. So both texts, with Onk. Tharg. both Arabs. Perf. and Gr. Ven. But Sep. seem to have read in their copy *בשער*, *pro Seir*—So Vulg. *de Seir*—and Syr. *ב שער*. This is no improbable reading: the *ב* and *ש* have been frequently interchanged; as hath been already remarked.

CHAP. II.

Ver. 10—12. I CANNOT perhaps do better than here transcribe the remark of the author of *Commentaries and Essays*: “These verses seem to be an interpolation, perhaps first placed in the margin, from which they crept into the text; as may have been the case with some other passages in this and other books of the Old Testament, and even in this chapter. But I take notice of this more particularly, as the interpolation is more plainly marked, than in some others: for it cuts in two the speech of God to Moses, and by a parenthesis in the midst of a speech, which has nothing to do with that speech, and which refers to a fact posterior to that speech*, as already past, betrays its non-authenticity in the most glaring manner. Leave out these three verses, and the 9th and 13th will appear connected. . . Our translators, indeed, add the words (said I), as if Moses were the speaker here. No such thing, however, is in the text; but it is the speech of God to Moses, commanding them to go over the brook Zered; and accordingly Moses adds: ‘and went over the brook Zered.’ . . . Verses 20, 21, 22, 23, seem an interpolation of the like kind, inserted also in the midst of a speech of God to Moses.” p. 303.—In ver. 12. instead of *The children of Esau dispossessed and destroyed them, and dwelled in their stead*: the Sam. copy has: *The children of Esau dispossessed them, for the Lord destroyed them from before them: so they dispossessed them, &c.* See Var. Read. vol. i. p. 303.

* He alludes to these words—“like as did the Israelites in the land, which the Lord gave to them for a possession:” which could not be written by Moses, because it records what was done after the time of Moses, after Israel had got possession of Chanaan. See Kennicott’s Remarks, p. 72. There are critics, however, who fancy that this difficulty is fully obviated, by giving to *רן*, *he gave*, the meaning of *he meant to give*. It gives one pain to find Rosenmüller adapting this conceit.

Ver. 20—23. The various readings in this interpolation are as follow: The Rom. ed. of Sep. in ver. 20. has *Ζορζομμω* instead of *Ζορζομμω*: which latter is the reading of Alex. Ald. has *Ζορμω*; and Comp. with Ox. have *Ζορμω* or *Ζορμω*. It is remarkable, however, that the Coptic version follows the Vatican lection. The *caph* and *mem* in the old Heb. characters are very like one another; and were therefore easily interchanged.—In ver. 21. after *a people great and powerful*, or *great and numerous*, *גדול ורבו*, the Septuagint add *και δυνατωτερον υμων* in Rom. and Comp. And so Copt. But Ald. has only the addition of *και ισχυρον*: and Alex. and Glasg. have only *και δυνατωτερον* without *υμων*. We wait for Dr. Holmes's collation. In the present original there is only *ורבו*, by Jerom rendered *proceræ longitudinis*: and so equivalently all the other versions.—In ver. 22. Sep. Rom. and Compl. have *ωσπερ εποικισεν*, as if they had read *עקע* instead of *עקע* (which was easily done in the ant. characters): but Ald. Alex. and Glasg. have *εποικισεν*. The Coptic version follows Rom.—In ver. 23. instead of *Hazerim*, *הצרם*, Sep. in ed. Rom. has *Ασθραβ*: but Ald. Comp. Alex. Glasg. with Copt. have either *Ασθραβ* or *Ασθραβ*.

Ver. 25. *Begin*. The present Heb. has *אומר*, I will begin: but Sam. and one of Kennicott's mss. have *אומר*: and so Sep. *Εναρχω*; as in the preceding verse, and again in ver. 31.

Ver. 29. What is said in this verse of the children of Esau and the Moabites is contrary to the history as related in Numbers 20. 18—20. Hear Rosenmüller's mode of reconciling the two passages: "*Quum Moses historiam itineris Israelitarum breviter duntaxat narraverit, ad horum locorum conciliationem nil certi potest afferri. Fortasse Israelitæ compendioſo in Cananæam uti itinere cupientes, per mediam transire voluerunt Idumæam, id quod obtinere non potuerunt; impetraverunt tantum hoc, ut libera pascua in Deferto ad fines Idumææ legrent, ibique in finibus tranſeuntes ab Idumæis alimenta et aquas pretio acciperent. Fortasse Edomitæ initio Israelitis tranſitum conceſſerunt, quem poſtea denegarunt.*" He might have inverted this last *fortasse*; and said as well: "*Edomitæ initio denegarunt tranſitum, quem poſtea conceſſerunt.*" The truth is: neither at first, nor at last, did the Edomites grant a passage to the Israelites. They were twice explicitly denied a passage; and "turned another way." Numb. 20. 21.

Ver. 36. *From Aroer, the city, &c.* That the city, here mentioned, is no other than Aroer itself, to me appears plain, from comparing chap. 3. 12. and Josh. 13. 9. The second comma *והעיר אשר בנחל* is only a more explicit determination of the site of Aroer. So rightly Jerom: *ab Aroer, quæ est super ripam torrentis, oppido quod in valle situm est, usque Galaad.* See Rem. on Josh. 13. 9.

C H A P. III.

Ver. 9. *SIRION*. *שירן*, or rather *שירן* as it is written in 19 mss. Sep. have *Σανωρ*; and one might imagine this to have been the original reading. It is less probable that two neighbouring nations would call the same mountain by names so different as *Sirion* and *Senir* or *Sbenir*: whereas there is only a very small dialectic difference between *Sanior* and *Senir*.

Ver. 11. *Whose coffin*. The Heb. word is *עש*, which commonly signifies *a bed*. But as it is here called *a bed of iron*; it is highly probable that it denotes *a coffin*; which meaning it has

in Arabic *. The Greeks used *ἀνν* in the same sense. Orestes in the *Chæphoræ* of Æschylus 316 calls his father's *biar*, or *tomb*, by that name. On this interpolation I shall present my readers with Dathe's note: "De hac pericopa multo magis quam de illis in precedente capite dubitari potest, an sit a manu Moſis, et non potius ab alia addita. Minimè quidem neceſſarium videtur, ut Moſes Iſraelitas doceat Ogum Baſanis regem fuiſſe gigantem, quippe eum viderant, et prælio cum eo decertarant. Verbum *וַיָּרֵךְ* verti non *letum*, ſed *feretrum*, ex conjectura Michaëlis non improbabili . . . Sed ſive per *letum*, ſive per *feretrum* vertatur, neutrum Iſraelitis innotefcere potuit, antequam David hanc Ammonitarum metropolin expugnaret " 2 Sam. 3. 31. multo minus Moſi, qui non ita longe poſt illud prælium cum Ogo commiſſum " e vita deceſſit."—Indeed, any one who can believe that Moſes wrote this, is ripe for believing any thing.—But why was the coffin of Og, a king of Baſhan, to be ſeen at the capital of the Ammonites, and not at his own capital Aſhtaroth? To this it is answered, with ſome probability, that, being wounded in the battle with the Iſraelites, he fled to Rabbath, and died and was buried there. So Michaëlis.

I have yet to remark on this verſe, that in the preſent Hebrew there is a word which ſeems to be an evident corruption: *וְהָיָה* for *וְהָיָה*; which latter is the reading of Sam. and of 13 of Kennicott's, and many of De Roſſi's mss. It was alſo read by all the ant. translators down to Gr. Ven. incluſively.

Ver. 17. *Aſdoth-Phisga*. I have retained the Hebrew name *אֲשְׁדוֹת־פִּישְׁגָּא*: but I have little doubt, that *אֲשְׁדוֹת* means the *ſtreams*, or *cataracls*, that fell from the mountain Phisga. See Rem. on ch. 33. 2.

CHAP. IV.

Ver. 19. *TO the worſhip of which*, &c. *אֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ דָּוִד אֱלֹהֵי אֲמֹן*. "In his verbis utique eſt agnoſcendus ſingularis ille loquendi uſus, ſecundum quem Hebræi quæcunque hominum facta ſeu conſuetudines, inſtituta a Deo proſecta ſolent appellare. Itaque ſenſus verborum illorum eſt hic: Quæ aſtra a cunctis exteris coli ſolerent, et quidem ita ut unus populus ſolem, alius Iltiam, &c. cultu divino proſequeretur: hoc enim hoc loco ſignificat verbum *הָלַךְ*." Roſenmüller. For the reſt, the word *כָּל* before the laſt *הָשֵׁמָה* is wanting in Sep. Vulg. and Syr. The other verſions mentioned in Var. Read. p. 307. belong not to this claſs. They relate to the word *אֲשֶׁר* before *דָּוִד*, which was read by Sep. Vulg. Syr. Onk. Tharg. Saad. Erp. but wanting in Perf. and Gr. Ven. One of Kennicott's mss. has (and another at firſt had) *אֲשֶׁר*; and this was the firſt reading of 2 of De Roſſi's.—The forementioned various reading is to be thus corrected. It is not, however, of much importance; as the text is, either way, complete in the ſenſe.

Ver. 20. *An iron furnace*: *כּוּר הַבַּרְזֵל*. Which words are not to be underſtood of a *furnace made of iron*; although Sep. and Vulg. ſeem ſo to have underſtood them †; but a furnace for

* It is the ſame with the Syr. *ܐܢܢܐ* or *ܐܢܢܐ*; which in the Syr. verſion of Luke 7. 14. correſponds with the Greek *νεκρὸς*. *אֲשֶׁר לִבְיָהּ*—*καὶ προσελθὼν ἤψατο τῆς σαρκοῦ*. † *ἐκ τῆς καίμου τῆς σιδηρᾶς*—*de furnace ferrea*. Not ſo Gr. Ven. which has very properly *ἀπὸ τῆς χαλκῆς τοῦ σιδήρου*. The Oriental verſions are ambiguous; but ought to be underſtood as the Hebrew.

smelting iron, than which nothing can be more tremendous. Take Rosenmüller's description of it: "Rotunda solet esse forma*, triginta fere aut plurimum pedum altitudine; strata habens carbonum mineraeque ferri confusae sibi invicem impositae (ita tamen ut summum stratum carbonum esse oporteat); ingenti folle ignem exsufflante, qui pulchrum oculis et terribile spectaculum praebet. In hac fornace ferrum ex minera excoquitur, acerrimo, quem ars metallurgorum efficere potest, igne.—Ob hunc vero ardorem non ferendum, et ob aspectum, quem noctu imprimis praebet, terribilem, talis fornax aptè dicitur *de servitute ista intoleranda, qua Israelitae in Egypto pressi fuerunt, cujusque memoria iis terribilis esse debebat.*"

Ver. 34. wrongly marked in Var. Read. 33. *By such great tremendous miracles.* The text has גְּדִלִים בְּמִרְאִים, *in terroribus magnis*. But Sam. has בְּמִרְאִים, *in visionibus*; and so read Sep. *ὑπομνήματα μεγάλα*—Vulg. *per horribiles visiones*—Onk. בְּמִרְאִים רַבִּירָן—and so also Tharg. and Syr. But both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven. seem to have read as the present text. I have expressed in my version both readings.

Ver. 37. In the present Heb. text there is in this verse a shameful corruption—בֹּרֵעַ אֲחֵרִים, for בֹּרֵעַם אֲחֵרִים, which is the Sam. lection. And so all the ant. interpreters; save Tharg. Arab. Erp. Perf. and Gr. Ven. who seem to have had before them the present faulty reading: which, however, our Rabbinical critics call only an *enallage*. If such an *enallage* had been found in the Sam. copy, we should have heard of it, by both ears.—The late Bp. Law has in his ms. notes given to בְּפָנָי, in this verse, a different meaning, "by his presence," i. e. his protection. Nor is this at all an improper or improbable rendering. Most of the ant. translators seem so to have understood it. The Septuagint, indeed, either read not the word in their copy, or overlooked it. But Jerom has *præcedens*—Onk. בְּמִצְרֵיהֶם—Syr. בְּפָרְצֻפָּה, which may be rendered *by his presence*. So equivalently Saad. and Perf. But Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. favour the other rendering. It is nearly all the same.

Ver. 48. *Unto Sirion*: for so it is called in chap. 3. 9. and so it is here written in the Syriac version. The present Heb. has שֵׁיטָן; but the Sam. copy has שֵׁיטָן: and this is the reading of Sep. Vulg. Onk. Tharg. both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven.: so that a cloud of witnesses favour the present reading. Yet, I confess, I am strongly inclined to believe, that Syr. alone has preserved the true reading; and have therefore inserted it in my version. Dathe acknowledges its *probability*; although he has left *Sion* in his translation†. It is remarkable that the Coptic version, made from the Septuagint, has *Sanior* here, as in chap. 3. 9. See the Rem. on that verse.

CHAP. V.

Ver. 11. SEE the Rem. on Exod. 20. 7.

Ver. 21. *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.* This precept in Exodus, in the present Heb. and most versions, is placed after *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house*: but, as all

* The word כֹּר in its radical meaning imports *rotundity*. † "In textu Heb. scribitur hoc nomen *Sion*: pro quo legendum *Sirion* ex cap. 3. 9. ubi Sidonios sic hunc montem vocasse narratur. Syrus interpres habet quoque illud nomen in utroque loco: sed quoniam reliqui cum textu Heb. consentiunt, nolui hanc l. & tionem, quoniam probabilem, in versionem recipere."—As *authority*, with me, begets not always *probability*, I have had no scruple in placing in my text what I deemed, independently of authority, the most probable reading.

the copies and versions here agree, and as Sep. with one Heb. ms. follows the same order in Exod. I have in both places kept to it. It is indeed of small moment, in itself; yet has given rise to a violent controversy about the proper division of the *ten commandments*, between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants. The former, with St. Austin, considered *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife*, as a precept distinct from that which follows; adhering to the order of arrangement in Deuteronomy: and that the number might not exceed *ten*, they took *Thou shalt not make to thyself a carved idol, &c.* as a part, and further explanation, of the first, *Thou shalt have no other gods, beside me*. The Protestants declaimed against this division; and some of them pretended that it was made of purpose to favour *image-worship*; as if the second commandment had been altogether thrown out of the Decalogue. But this was pure misrepresentation; although it has been occasionally propagated to the present day, and by persons who are deemed *masters in Israel*. In shorter catechisms and elementary books of instruction, the commandments are sometimes abridged thus: *Thou shalt have no other gods, before me, &c.—Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, &c.—Remember to keep holy the sabbath day, &c.—Honour thy father and thy mother, &c.—Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, &c.*—But in all bodies of doctrine, and in the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, commonly called The Catechism of the Council of Trent, there is no such abbreviation used: nor was such abbreviation ever thought of as a screen to conceal *idolatry*; as too many Protestants have asserted.

As to the division itself, I am of opinion that the Roman Catholics are in the wrong. The Protestant division, which is that of Josephus*, is more agreeable to the original text, in which there is no copulative between what Protestants call the first and the second; by the Romanists joined in one: whereas there is uniformly a copulative between the last two in the Roman division; whether *wife* be put before *house*, as in Deuteronomy, or *house* before *wife*, as in Exodus.

Ver. 29. *And keep my commandments*. I follow Sam. Sep. Saad. who read not כִּלְכֵּל before וְשָׁמַר: which, however, was read by all the other translators down to Gr. Ven. inclusively: and, consequently, it is an almost equally probable reading. On the whole, it is all one: for the precepts of the Lord are all his precepts. See the Rem. on ch. 27. 26.

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 4. *THE Lord, the Lord only, is our God*: כִּי יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה: by our translators rendered, "The Lord our God is one Lord:" which, by Delgado, is thus corrected: "The Lord *is* our God, the Lord is one:" as if there were two propositions in the comma: and Doc-

* The division of Josephus is the more remarkable, as he not only separates the commands, in different sentences; but prefixes the words *first, second, third, &c.* to the respective precepts. Διδασκει μὲν οὖν ὁ ΠΡΩΤΟΣ λόγος, ὅτι Θεὸς ἓστιν ἕως, καὶ ταύτην σέβασθαι μόνον.—Ὁ δὲ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ καλεῖται, μηδενὸς εἰκόνα ζῶντι ποιήσαντας προσκυνεῖν.—Ὁ δὲ ΤΡΙΤΟΣ δὲ, μηδενὶ φανῶντι τῶν Θεῶν ὁμνῶν.—Ὁ δὲ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΣ, παρατηρεῖν τὰς ἑβδομάδας, ἀποπαυομένους ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου.—Ὁ δὲ ΠΕΜΠΤΟΣ, γόνιμι τιμᾶν.—Ὁ δὲ ΕΨΤΟΣ, ἀποσχεσθαι φόρου.—Ὁ δὲ ΕΒΔΟΜΟΣ, μὴ μοιχεύειν.—Ὁ δὲ ΟΓΔΩΟΣ, μὴ κλοπῇ δέχαι.—Ὁ δὲ ΕΝΝΑΤΟΣ, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρεῖν.—Ὁ δὲ ΔΕΚΑΤΟΣ, μηδενὸς ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιθύμειν λαμβάνειν. Ant. lib. iii. c. 5. No. 5. p. 129. This division corresponds with that of Philo, and was followed by the Greek Fathers, and by the Latin Fathers too, before Austin.

tor Campbell has, in a note on Mark 12. 29. laboured to prove that this is the true meaning. Vitranga was of the same opinion: and it must be allowed that it is specious. I cannot however subscribe to it, for the following reasons: 1st, It was differently understood by all the ancient interpreters; who considered the words as only one proposition: although, I think, they did not render them in the most proper terms*. 2dly, The Hebrew idiom seems repugnant to such a construction. I am therefore inclined to think, that *יהוה* here means not simply *one*, but *alone* and *singular*: such as the God of the Hebrews is every where described. The natural interpretation then will be; "The Lord is our God, the Lord only:" or, as I have rendered, "The Lord, the Lord only, is our God." "Occurrit ita Moses ei gentium superstitioni, quæ sæpe unum eundemque Deum sacitium, velut Baalem, Jovem, sub diversis nominibus colebat; adeoque non solum plures deos, sed etiam unum eundemque Deum, diversis nominibus, in plures alios longè diversos deos quasi multiplicatum, stulta religione venerabatur." Rosenmüller.

Ver. 8. *Inscribe them* (the commands of God) *on the posts of your houses, &c.* It is still customary among the Arabs, and other oriental nations, to write passages of the Koran, and other moral sentences, on the gates of cities, walls, and door-posts. See Niebuhr and other travellers in the East.

Ver. 13. I will here insert Kennicott's note, for the sake of making some observations on it: "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, AND SERVE HIM. The Scripture tells us, that some men worshipped false gods together with the true. And if this text commanded the worship of *the God of Israel*, and not of him only, it would not clearly condemn such false communion: nor would it be conclusive, as CHRIST himself has quoted it. The context, when clear, is a safe guide; and here it is quite *exclusive*. It therefore follows, that the Heb. text *ואת יהוה תעבד* was originally *ואת לבד תעבד*, 'et ei soli servies;' as in the Greek and Vulgate versions. This reading, thus confirmed, justifies the citation of it made by Christ, when he put the Tempter to silence and flight, by saying, IT IS WRITTEN: And Him ONLY shalt thou serve. Matt. 4. 10. Luke 4. 8."—Although it be probable, that the Septuagint, and perhaps Jerom, read in their copies the word *לבד*, it is not an absolute proof that it so stood in the original. There is no vestige of it in either the present Heb. or Sam. copies; nor in any of the other versions: and Christ's citing it in his answer to the Tempter is not a sure guarantee for its originality. He quoted it, as it was then read in the Jewish synagogues, from the Septuagint, or perhaps from a Syriac version corresponding with Sep. But it was Dr. Kennicott's method to make the quotations in the N. T. a criterion of the text of the O. T.; which is contrary to the canons of sound criticism.—For the rest, it is clear that the word *לבד*, *only*, is understood throughout this verse: although in my version I have only once put it in common letters, on the foresaid authority of Sep. and Vulg.

* Sep. *Κυριος ο Θεος ημων κυριος εις σοι*—Vulg. *Dominus deus noster Dominus unus est*—and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. Syr. both Arabic, and Pers. none of which, I conceive, expresses the force of the original. The Greek of Venice comes the nearest: *ο ορισμενος ο Θεος ημων ο ορισμενος εις*; and if *εις* be ever allowed to mean *solus*, *alone*, it would be in my estimation a complete and literal rendering.

CHAP. VII.

Ver. 7. DOCTOR Kennicott's Rem. on this verse is more pertinent: "The nations, driven out by Israel, are here enumerated thus: *Hittites, Girgashites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, Jebusites*: and they are expressly called **seven**. They are also named in six other parts of the Pentateuch; but in the Heb. text imperfectly in all these six places . . . but in all these places the seven nations are all expressed in the Sam. Pentateuch."—He might have added that, in all those places, the Sam. copy is supported by Sep.

Ver. 2. *Ye shall devote them* [the Chanaanite nations] *to utter destruction*—חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם—Sep. ἀφανισμὸν ἀφανίσεις αὐτούς—Vulg. *percuties eas* [gentes] *usque ad internecionem*—Onk. חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם—and still more explicitly Tharg. חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם חָרַם—and so equivalently both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven. whose version is as strong as any, *καὶ αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐξολοθρευμένων ἐξολοθρεύσεις αὐτούς*.—In short, nothing can be clearer than that the utter destruction of the seven Chanaanite nations is enjoined in this Mosaical precept: nor was this doubted by any translator, interpreter, or commentator, till toward the close of the eighteenth century. They all tell us, indeed, that it was a *reasonable, a necessary* command: for that "to spare such rank, incurable idolaters would have been cruelty to themselves and *their posterity*.*" But still they allow that such a precept was given, and endeavour to justify it by reasonings, which, to me, appear frivolous in the extreme, and totally repugnant to the evangelical doctrines of Christianity.—It was this consideration, I doubt not, which induced some very modern writers to maintain, that such an injunction was never given!

Not so the candid, the learned, the liberal prelate, who wrote, a short while ago, an *Apology for the Bible*. He was conscious that the fact could not be controverted; but he endeavours to justify it on principles, which at first sight seem specious; but which, in my apprehension, will not bear a minute inspection. He is astonished that the author of *The Age of Reason* "should attempt to disparage the Bible by bringing forward the exploded and frequently refuted† objection of Morgan, Tindal, and Bolingbroke—You profess yourself (adds he) to be a Deist, and to believe that there is a God, who created the universe and established the laws of nature; by which it is sustained in existence. You profess, that from the contemplation of the works of God you derive a knowledge of his attributes; and you reject the Bible, because it ascribes to God things inconsistent (as you suppose) with the attributes which you have discovered to belong to him: and, in particular, you think it repugnant to his moral justice, that he should doom to destruction the crying or smiling infants of the Canaanites. Why do you not maintain it to be repugnant to his moral justice, that he should suffer

* Were not the Moabites, and Ammonites, and other neighbouring nations, as gross idolaters as the Chanaanite nations? Yet there is no injunction to utterly destroy them. It was not then the mere idolatry of the Chanaanites that brought about their destruction; but their idolatry and other abominations were made pretexts to dispossess them of their lands and properties, in order to transfer them to the Israelites.

† This mode of expression, so common among controversialists, I confess I never could relish. It may be equally used, and has been used, by both parties: for nothing is more easy to say than—"Your argument has already been often answered and confuted." Bellarmine might say so to Barclay, and Barclay to Bellarmine: and, if Bolingbroke, Tindal or Morgan were now alive, they would most probably deny that their arguments had been refuted. Certainly, every answer is not a refutation.

"crying or smiling infants to be swallowed up by an earthquake, drowned by an inundation, consumed by a fire, starved by a famine, or destroyed by a pestilence? The word of God is in perfect harmony with his work: crying or smiling infants are subjected to death in both. . . . When Catania, Lima and Lisbon were severally destroyed by earthquakes; men with their wives, their sons and their little ones, were swallowed up alive: why do you not spurn, as spurious, the book of nature, in which this fact is certainly written, and from the perusal of which you infer the moral justice of God*?"

In the Preface to the second volume of my version of the Bible (p. ii. in the note) I have said, that it grieved me to read in a late elegant *Apology* so lame a justification of the passage in question; and added: "*I am tempted sometimes to think*, that the R. R. author must have felt the weakness of his argument, and seen the disparity of his simile." I used the words *tempted to think*, because I could not bring myself to believe that the Bishop *did* feel the weakness of his argument. I am persuaded that he considered it as a strong argument: and, perhaps, what I am now going to write against it, will not move him to alter his opinion. I will, however, make an essay.

In the first place, then, I trust his Lordship will agree with me, that there is but one clear, explicit, immutable law of moral equity, implanted by the wise Creator in the human mind: ALTERI NE FECERIS, QUOD TIBI FIERI NON VIS. It is this law which, independent of any revelation, tells us, that we must not steal, we must not kill, we must not injure our neighbour: and if this hold good, and be obligatory with respect to individuals, it must be equally so with regard to whole families, tribes and nations, which are composed of individuals. According to this, I believe indisputable, principle, the Israelitic nation had no more right to invade, dispossess and exterminate the Chanaanites, than these had to invade, dispossess and exterminate the Israelites. "True (it will possibly be said) in the abstract, and bating particular circumstances: but God, who is the sovereign arbiter of the world, and author of the laws of nature, whether *physical* or *moral*, may, when he pleases and sees occasion, dispense with the general moral law ALTERI NE FECERIS, &c. and give a special positive law in direct opposition to it."—I might obstinately deny this assertion, and maintain that he could not, without being himself unjust: nor do I see what solid argument could be adduced to prove the contrary; for I presume my antagonist would hardly have recourse to the argument of tyrants: SUCH IS OUR PLEASURE.—But, granting that an arbitrary, omnipotent Being have a right to transfer my property to you, and authorise you to murder me and mine offspring for the purpose of securing that transfer; I must have strong proofs indeed of the existence of such an instrument, and of its having been issued from the chancery of Heaven, before I could submit to so uncommon a dispensation of providence: and even then, I fear, it would only be a bare submission: my soul would interiorly murmur, and wonder how this could be reconcileable with the justice of that Supreme Being, who has so deeply imprinted on the tablet of my mind, the idea, that no one is to do to another, what he wishes not to be done to himself.—"But what if I were an egregious sinner, who had deserved to be dispossessed of my property and bereaved of my life?"—An egregious sinner! In the estimation of whom? Not surely of you my destroyer! I should consider you as a partial judge; and might deem you as great a

* *Apology*, p. 14, 15, 16.

sinner as myself. "Not merely in my estimation (you reply), but in the estimation of God; who, knowing all things, must know, that you are a most enormous sinner, deserving death and destruction."—Be it so—he has a thousand ways and means to destroy me, without employing you as an instrument—and before I believe that he has chosen you for that purpose, I must have far other proofs than your bare assertion; especially as I find that you are interested in the matter, and are to reap the fruits of my destruction. But if the order, which you say you have received from heaven, be to dispossess and destroy not only my *guilty* self, but my *guiltless* infants and posterity, I become still more astonished and more incredulous; and desire to see and peruse your commission, with the broad seal of Heaven upon it:—nay, were you to produce such a commission in the name of Heaven, I should insist on its being a fabrication of your own; and that it could not come from the same God who says: *that children shall not be punished for the sins of their fathers.*

Now, as we have no other proof that God commanded Moses and his Israelites (who themselves were so sinful a people that he often threatened to destroy them) to dispossess and extirpate the Chanaanites, man, woman, and infant, than the bare assertion of an Hebrew historian—suppose it even to be Moses himself—the Chanaanites must have necessarily considered the God of Moses as an unjust God; or believed, that the pretended command to dispossess and exterminate them was a counterfeit.—We are then, I think, warranted to say that it is infinitely more probable that God never gave such an order, so opposite to the general law of moral equity, than that he dispensed with this law, in favour of a particular nation, with respect to the Chanaanites; howsoever great their sins or grievous their abominations: which, by the bye, we know only from the same partial interested pen, that has recorded the decree of their proscription.

I cannot help dwelling yet a little longer on this topic. Suppose *yourself*, my Lord Bishop of Landaff, to be living in the quiet possession of your own estate in Westmoreland; and then suppose *me* to be a Gallican refugee bishop, escaped from the tyranny of Robespierre, and the fangs of French atheism. Were I, in this supposition, to claim your inheritance, under the pretext that I had a special commission from God to dispossess and extirpate you and your *race*; would you not call in question the veracity of the document? Would you tamely submit to be despoiled of your life and fortune; and not try to repel force by force? In vain might I allege, that you were a grievous sinner, a vile obstinate heretic, an enemy to God and his *spouse* the Church; and on that account meriting extermination: you would, with indignation, deny the charge; and perhaps retaliate, and call me, in return, a superstitious idolater.—Decm not this a jocular argument: I meant it as a very serious one.

The Chanaanites were in much the same predicament, when they were invaded by the Israelites; as your Lordship would be, if invaded by a Romish fugitive bishop: nor am I very sure, but that the Romish bishop could produce even more plausible arguments for the expulsion and perdition of an English heretic, than the Israelites could bring for expelling and extirpating the idolatrous Chanaanites. At least, he would not fail to make use of the command to exterminate the Chanaanites, as a divine precedent, which he might safely follow: and in this he would do no more than has been done not only by the religionists of Rome, but by those of all other denominations, when they had a mind to persecute and proscribe those

of a different creed. And this naturally leads me to take notice of the Bishop's ~~style~~, which, in my opinion, halts exceedingly.

When the earthquake swallows up, the sea overwhelms, the fire consumes, the famine starves, or the plague destroys; we are totally ignorant by what laws of nature, or concatenation of causes, the desolating events happen: we see only the dismal effects: and no consequence can rationally be deduced from them, against the principle of moral equity, ~~as~~ often before mentioned. From such events no one could derive an argument for the lawfulness of dispossessing or injuring his neighbour, either in his property or person; no argument for the lawfulness of burying alive idolaters, drowning heretics, starving atheists, &c. &c. From such events the famous Bishop of Cagliari, Lucifer, could never have inferred, that it was the duty of the orthodox to kill the Arians, and even the Emperor Constantius, who abetted Arianism*. From the earthquakes at Catania, Lima, Lisbon, the Holy Inquisition could never have concluded that it was lawful and meritorious to burn the bodies and confiscate the goods of Moors, Jews, and wicked infidels. But the express command of God to extirpate whole nations on account of their sins, and to transfer their goods and chattels to another chosen people, was a precedent, exactly suited to their sanguinary purposes, and triumphantly employed by them to obviate all objections, on the score of cruelty.

The same inferential arguments were made use of in the Valdensian persecution, and indeed in every persecution for the sake of religion, since persecution began. The supposed divine commission given to the Jews to extirpate the Chanaanites, and Amalekites, has ever been, in the mouths of Judaizing Christians, a positive and plausible plea for committing the most cruel injustices.

On the whole, then, I must repeat it; I cannot possibly believe, that ever a just, benevolent Being, such as I conceive my God to be, gave such a sanguinary order to Moses and the Israelites, as in the book of Deuteronomy he is said to have given.—Let others think otherwise: I will not quarrel with them on that account: nor shall I again return to the subject, on any provocation.

Ver. 10. *But instantly repaying those who disregard him, by destroying them.* The Hebrew is וְשָׁמַל לְשֹׂנְאָיו אֵל פָּנָיו לְהָאָבִיד; in our common version rendered, “and repayeth them that hate him to their face, to destroy them.” The difficulty lies in the words אֵל פָּנָיו, or, as Sam. על פָּנָיו: which are variously rendered by the antients—Sep. *ante prospectum*—Vulg. *faciem*—Onk. קִדְמוֹ—Syr. בְּרִיחָא, *in vultu eorum*—and so equivalently both Thargums, and Arab. Erp. followed by Rosenmüller†.—Michaelis, after Grotius, imagines that אֵל פָּנָיו here signifies *openly*,

* See his five Declamations against the Emperor, in the fourth volume of *Bibliotheca Patrum*; or in the 8vo edition of Paris 1568. This work was highly applauded by the Athanasian party; who considered him as the organ of the Holy Ghost, on this occasion; without whose special assistance (they said) he could never have so well understood, and so properly applied, the texts of holy writ!

† “Equidem verba vertere malim, cum Syro et Arabe Erpeniano *“in vita ejus; dum adhuc in vivis est, improbum pœnis, quas meritus est, afficit. Quæ interpretatio non repugnat usui loquendi, uti Dathio visum est. Nam infra c. 21. 17. (16.) אֵל פָּנָיו significat supersit adhuc, dum in vita est. i. q. “by Gen. 11. 28. Num. 3. 4.”—But not one of these examples is, in my opinion, available against Dathe's objection: as they are all resolvable into another acceptation, and meet not the present case.—Houbigant, however, was of a different opinion, as he renders *dum vivunt*; equivalent to Rosenmüller's *supersit adhuc*. Jarhi and some other Rabbins explain the words in a similar manner.*

manifestly, before their eyes: and this meaning is not a little favoured by a similar use of *κατα προσωπον* in Greek; which are here used by Sep. and by the apostle Paul, Galat. 2. 11. *κατα προσωπον σωτη. αντηστην*.—Dathe rejects all these interpretations, as contrary to the usual modes of speech: “In his omnibus desidero probationem ex usu loquendi. Mihi quidem videtur פרוח dictum esse pro nomine reciproco *ille, ipse*, ut Exod. 33. 15. Deut. 4. 37. “2 Sam. 17. 11. Latine non commodè iisdem verbis exprimi potest: igitur notionem, quæ “vocabulo Hebræo subesse videtur, cum sequenti לְהַחֲזִיק conjunctim indicavi.” His version of the comma is: *Qui vero etiam rependat sui osoribus presentissima pernicie*: which, in fact, is the same with mine and Jerom’s: to which add that of Saadias בְּרִצְרִיתָ. And, although, at present, I recollect not an instance of *κατα προσωπον* having the same meaning, it runs strongly in my imagination, that such instances are to be found. The Latin *impresentiarum* and our *presently* have a similar etymon.—What convinces me that פרוח אל or פרוח על has here this meaning, is the parallelism in the following comma לֹא יִחַרְרֶנּוּ, *he will not procrastinate*: but will instantly repay him: where the words פרוח אל are repeated.

Ver. 26. *Hornets*. See Rem. on Exod. 23. 28.

CHAP. VIII.

Ver. 4. *YE have not, these forty years, worn tattered clothes, &c.* Heb. שְׂמֹלֶתְךָ לֹא בִלְחָה שְׁמֹלֶתְךָ—by our translators rendered: “thy raiment waxed not old upon thee.” So Sep. *ἡματία σου οὐκ ἐκαλαιώθη ἀπὸ σου*—Vulg. *vestimentum tuum, quo operiebaris, nequaquam vetustate deficit*—and so equivalently all the versions down to Gr. Ven. inclusively: ἡ ἀναβολή σου οὐ πεκαλαιώται ἀπὸ σοῦ: by which translations one would be led to imagine, what credulous Jews, and credulous Christians, believe; that, during those forty years, the clothes of the Israelites wore not out! This comes of too literal translations. The obvious meaning of the original is, that they never were under the necessity of wearing tattered raiment. The note of Rosenmüller is here so pertinent, that I subjoin it below*. For the rest, the Greek addition in Sep. *τα ὑποδήματα σου οὐ κατετριβή ἀπὸ σου*, although wanting in all the copies, that I have seen, except the Roman edition, is yet so probable from the parallel place chap. 29. 5. that I am inclined to deem it a genuine part of the text†. I have transposed it, however, to the end of the colon, for the sake of greater perspicuity.

* “Sensus est, tantam fuisse Israelitis vestium copiam, ut non opus esset eas laceratas a longo usu tritas geri; non defuisse eis ad amicum necessaria: id quod etiam historia docet. Habuerunt enim Israelitæ greges ovium, caprarum et boum copiosos (Num. 32. 1. Deut. 3. 19.) unde satis magna lanæ et corii copia. Adfuerunt in populo textores peritissimi, qui pro Aaron et tabernaculo nitidissima texerent vela et vestimenta. Mulieres adeo peritæ erant artis textoriæ (Exod. 35. 25.). Hinc non est opus, ut cum Judæorum magistris accipiamus, miraculo esse factum, ut Israelitarum vestes non solum non usu adtritæ essent, sed præterea etiam cum corpore eorum crescerent. Bene hanc inaptam et ridiculam opinionem ridet Hermannus von-der-hardt; qui ipse et rectam illam a nobis allatam interpretationem proposuit in *Epimeridibus Philologicis* Discurs. xii. et in *Epistolis anacris*, p. 340, &c.” † It is remarkable, that Onkelos renders the verse thus: לֹא יִחַרְרֶנּוּ מִכָּל מְסָרָהּ וּמִכָּל מְסָרָהּ: *Thy raiment grew not old, and thy shoes were not worn, &c.* He seems to have read in his Heb. copy יִחַרְרֶנּוּ with Sep. but without the following words of the present text, וּמִכָּל מְסָרָהּ; whereas Sep. read both commas.

Ver. 15. *Out of the flinty rock*—שֹׁהַן הָאֶבֶן—Sep. ἐκ πετρῶς ἀποτομου—Vulg. *ex durissima*—Onk. מִבְּרֶחַק מִן הָאֶבֶן—Syn. מִבְּרֶחַק מִן הָאֶבֶן—Etp. מִבְּרֶחַק מִן הָאֶבֶן. The last three, then, seem to have understood שֹׁהַן to be *flint*: yet this is not certain.—Perf. has אֶבֶן, in Pol. rendered *marmorea*: if with propriety, I doubt.—Gr. Ven. ἐκ πετρῶς τῆς ἀποτομου—almost all generical terms, applicable to any hard rock.—The Heb. word occurs only five times: out of which it is in our common version rendered four times *flint*; and once, in Job, *a rock*.—Etymology gives little assistance. Some derive it from שָׁחַק to *break*, and שָׁחַק to *recede*. “A hard stone (says Parkhurst) whose parts when broken *recede* or *fly off*.”—But this surely is not a natural etymon.—Michaëlis has laboured to show, that שֹׁהַן is a species of *granite*, or *porphyry*, which abounds about mounts Sinai and Horeb; and which Wallerius, in his *Mineralogical System*, tom. i. p. 408. thus describes: “*Granites rubescens, cum quartzo pingui semipellucido; granito rosso Italicè. Est saxum compositum e spato scintillante rubente, quartzo pingui semipellucido, et particulis micaceis, in majoribus vel minoribus quasi maculis accumulatis.*”

CHAP. IX.

Ver. 8. *AT Horeb even, &c.* The word *even* is here more significative than *also*; and better connects the text. I request the critical reader to compare, throughout the chapter, my version with the public one, and with the Hebrew and Samaritan texts.

Ver. 10. Delgado has justly remarked, that our translators ought not to have omitted the word *the* before *tables of stone*; as, in the next verse, they ought to have rendered, “*the* forty days,” &c. In both places Gr. Ven. has very properly the article: τὰ δὴν ὡλόκαλε—τῶν τετρακαισάκοντῃ ἡμέραις. By Sep. however, it was omitted in both places.

Ver. 12. I have not ranked Onk. with the versions that read “*thou:*” although the Latin version in Pol. has *præcepisti*; because, independently of the punctuation, לָקַח may be either the second or first person.

Ver. 15. The addition *up to the heavens, ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, marked among the Var. Read. is only in the Rom. ed. of Sep. But it is also in the Coptic version: which shows that, if it be an interpolation, it is an ancient one. Perhaps it will be found in some of Dr. Holmes’s mss. See P. P. ch. 4. 11.

Ver. 21. It is allowed that this verse, where it now stands in the text, is a manifest ὑστέρων ἄρτιον: for the burning of the golden calf happened priorly to what is related ver. 18, &c.—I have therefore, with little hesitation, placed it between verses 17 and 18. I have also ventured to transpose ver. 20 to the end of the chapter, after ver. 29.; and verses 22, 23, and 24, to the next chapter after ver. 11. I am persuaded, that the attentive reader will find this arrangement more clear and consistent than the common one: and as nothing is taken from the text, I trust such transpositions will be deemed pardonable. Those who think otherwise, need only to retranspose the said verses to their former seats.

1b. *By a thorough grinding*—שֹׁחַק מְאֹד—Sep. καταλίσας σφῆρα—Vulg. *in frustra comminans*—Onk. מִבְּרֶחַק מִן הָאֶבֶן, in Pol. rendered *in pillo* (read *pilo*) *vehementer* *: but by Buxtorf *limā*

* The translator of Tharg. has also rendered the same word in *mortario*.

bene: and certainly the word שופנים in 1 Sam. 13. 21. cannot signify a pestle.—Both Arabs have מכרר, which undoubtedly signifies a file. But the Hebrew word, I think, will not admit that meaning: and Syr. Perf. and Gr. Ven. all confirm the other signification. But in what sort of a mill the golden calf was ground into dust, it is impossible to determine. See the Rem. on Exod. 32. 20.

CHAP. X.

Ver. 6, 7. THE confusion here, and the irreconcilability of the text with Numb. 33. are evident. I refer the reader to Kennicott's second *Dissertation on the State of the Hebrew Text*, and to his posthumous Remarks, p. 74. Some of the difficulties are removed by the Sam copy; but not them all. Lillienthal and Hezel have done their best to produce something like an agreement between the jarring passages; but to me they appear to have laboured in vain: and Rosenmüller, I find, is of the same opinion*.

CHAP. XI.

Ver. 10. *WITH the labour of your feet*—ברגלך—Sam. and 1 ms. רגלך—and so Sep. τοῖς ποσὶ—*and* Syr. כרגלך—The rest seem to have read in the singular. The writer is, with great probability, supposed to allude to an engine still used in Egypt for the purpose of watering ground. It is thus described by Niebuhr: "Toute la machine consiste en une seule roue, qui a huit rais attachés à l'axe, et quatre autres plus petits, qui sont, deux à deux, vis-à-vis l'un l'autre, de chaque côté de l'axe de la roue. Pour s'en servir on creuse un puits, sur lequel on couche deux poutres, pour soutenir la machine; et à l'une des extrémités de la roue on couche, sur les deux poutres, un morceau de bois, sur lequel s'assied le travailleur. Il n'a pas besoin d'autre appui; mais il travaille à la fois des mains et des pieds †." *Voyage*, vol. i. p. 121.—I have, at Paris, seen windlasses of a similar construction, and worked after the same manner, to raise large stones to the top of a wall.

* "Quæ adfert Lilienthal, et repetit Hezel, ut hæc loca in concordiam redigantur, nimis artificiosa et contorta videntur. In cod. quidem Sam. noster hic locus optime convenit cum Numerorum loco: sed quæ in isto codice leguntur sapient critici aliquis Samaritani manu emendatricem; quum nulli codices Heb. nulla versio antiqua, ne Alexandrina quidem, nostrum locum aliter legant.—Equidem putarem, cum Dathio, hos versus plane non esse a Mose, sed ab alia manu insertos; profus enim alieni sunt a Mosis consilio, populum ad obedientiam legi divine prestandam adhortantis."—I cannot so readily allow, that the Sam. copy has been amended by the hand of criticism: it is more probable that the Hebrew copy has been vitiated, although at an early period; and infected all the ancient translations made from it.—The passage might perhaps come naturally in after ver. 11. especially if we transpose verses 22—24 of chap. 9. as I have done in my version.—On the whole, however, the text is better without verses 6 and 7 of chap. 10. and I have on that account placed them below the text, among the Various Readings. † This is precisely the *beliz*, or *beliaz*, of Philo; to which he compares an impertinent babbler, who talks without end, and confounds every thing—ἀσκηρ ἢ ἐλιξ, τοῦ ὑπερβολὸν ὀργάνου, ἔχει· κατὰ γὰρ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς γεγονασὶ βαθμοὶ τινες, ὥν δ' γεωπόνους, ἐπὶν ὑβέλγησιν ποτίσθαι τὰς ἀρούρας, ἐπιθαινει μὲν, περιελισσθαι δ' ἀναγκάσιμος ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ μὴ σπῆλαιν, συνεχῶς πληροῖον ἐχυροῦ τινος, ταῖς χερσὶ περιδρατίζεται, ὅν ἐπιλημμένους τοῦ ὅλον σωμα ἀπαρκεῖν αὐτοῦ. Αὐτὶ μὲν γὰρ ποδοῦν χερσίν, αὐτὶ δὲ χερσὶν ποσὶ χρεῖται· ἰσάται μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ χερσίν, δι' ὧν εἰσὶν αἱ παραχῆς· παρὰ τῆς δ' ἐν ποσίν, ἐφ' ὧν εἰσὶν ἰσάσθαι.—De Confus. Ling. tom. iii. p. 330, nov. edit.—See also Harmer's *Observations*, vol. ii. p. 236.

Ver. 21. *Like the days of the heavens, over the earth.*—יָמֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם עַל הָאָרֶץ—Sep. *Yamim ha-shamayim al ha-aretz*—*ἡμέραι του οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*—Vulg. *Quamdiu caelum immineat terrae*, which perfectly, although not literally, expresses the meaning of the original.

Ver. 24. *The furber sea* is the méditerranean; thus distinguished from the *higher sea*, or sea of Sodom; *mare mortuum*.

CHAP. XII.

Ver. 5. *MAY choose to name for his own residence.* The Heb. is **יָבֹחַ שְׁמוֹ אֶת שְׁמוֹ שָׁם לְרֵשִׁיתוֹ** (Sam. **לְרֵשִׁיתוֹ**)—Lit. *may choose to put his name there, to inhabit it*: i. e. may choose to have called by his name—the place of his particular residence. The words, as Dathe observes, are to be explained by an equivalent phrase, **לֵשֵׁן שְׁמוֹ שָׁם**, *ut nomen ejus ibi inhabitet*; that is, *ut ipse ibi habitet*. “Quis enim nescit nomen Dei esse idem quod Deus ipse? Deus vbi ibi habitare dicitur, ubi ex voluntate sua colitur.”—For the rest, the Syriac translator divided the colon in a different manner, and took **שָׁם** for a noun: and this division is followed by Dathe* and others. In the same verse **וְנִבְחַת**, in the present Heb. is evidently an error: read **וְנִבְחַתָּ** with Sam. but not with all the versions, as Dathe and Rosenmüller too rashly affirm: for Arab. Etp. Pers. and Gr. Ven. read in the singular. Their copies then had **וְנִבְחַת** or **וְנִבְחַתָּ**, most probably the latter, which is still the reading of 3 mss. and was more readily changed from **וְנִבְחַתָּ**, than the other reading, from the similarity of **ה** and **ב** in some mss.

Ver. 6. Among the things which the Israelites are here ordered to bring to the place which the Lord shall choose for his residence, are the *firstlings of their herds and flocks*. But these had been previously ordained to be given to the Levites as a part of their salary. Were they to receive them, only at the place, where the Lord should choose to have his residence? This is by no means probable.—Were there then two sorts of firstlings, as well as two sorts of tithes? So Michaelis conjectures, and has laboured to prove in his *Mosaisches Recht*, part. ii. sect. 145. and part. iv. sect. 192. According to him, the assignation made to the Levites was a Mosaic institution; but that here mentioned a prior usage, not abrogated by him: an usage perhaps as old as the days of Jacob: and this idea is adopted by Dathe†: but neither have supported it with satisfactory arguments.—Delgado saw the difficulty, but obviates it in a manner to me not quite intelligible. His note on ver. 7. is: “This refers to ver. 6. The pronoun accusative *them* should be added after the verb *eat*; and the nominative pronoun *ye* must be understood partially; for *the heave-offering of your hands*, and *firstling*, must refer to the priests. The *tithe* doth not mean that which belongeth to the Levites; as that might be eaten any where; but

* Ad hoc ejus domicilium, ad eum consulendum convenietis. But all the other ant. translators considered לעבד as a part of the former comma, and שכן as a verb : and the Sam. text is explicit, having לעבדו. † " Recte, ut arbitror, illustr. Michaëlis statuit, ut decimarum, ita quoque primogenitorum, duplex genus fuisse ; alterum quod Deo seu Levitis in partem salarii datum sit, alterum quod ab Israelitis in epulis sacrificialibus consumeretur : illud quidem Moſen in populo Iſraelitico primum inſtituiſſe, hoc vero ut ritum antiquum, forſiſſe inde a Jacobo ſervatum, inveniſſe, acque abrogaviſſe . . . Clericus ad ver. 17. exiſtimat, primogenitum pecus vocari pinguiſſimum, epulis ſacrificialibus conſecratum, ex uſu hujus vocis בכור ſatis noto ; quo nonnunquam pro optimo in ſuo genere dicitur. Sed, ut tacram, tropicam vocum ſignificationem in legum interpretationem non facile eſſe admittendam, refellit hanc ſententiam cap. 15. 19. ubi eadem lex repetita eſt, ibique additur omnes, כל הבכור : ſed duriffima lex fuiſſet, ſi omnia amenta pinguis epulis ſacrificialibus debuiffent iſumi."—A hard law, indeed !

CHAP. XIV.

Ver. 4, 5. THE first four names of animals allowed to be eaten are certain; the rest doubtful. What I render the *antelope*, דָּרְסִי, is by Sep. rendered *dercas*—by Vulg. *caprea*—by Michaëlis *reb*—by Dathe *caprea*—by Rosenmüller *antelope dorcas*.

The *bart-beest*—דָּרְסִי—Sep. *ῥαβδολος**—Vulg. *bubalus*—Michaëlis retains the Heb. word *jachmur*—Dathe *jachmur*. There is little doubt but it is the same animal which the Arabs still call by the same name. It is frequent about the Euphrates, and is a species of the *gazelle*.—See Bochart. Hieroz. p. i. lib. iii. c. 22.

The *goat-deer*—דָּרְסִי—Sep. *τραγελᾶφος*—Vulg. *tragelaphus*†—Michaëlis *steinbock*—Dathe *tragelaphus*.

The *spring-bok*—דָּרְסִי—Sep. *πυργαργος*—Vulg. *pygargus*—Michaëlis and Dathe *disibon*, the Heb. word.

The *wood-goat*—דָּרְסִי—Sam. דָּרְסִי—Sep. *ορυξ*—Vulg. *oryx*—Michaëlis *büffelochse*—Dathe *bubalus*—and our traveller Shaw is of the same opinion.

The *camelopard*—דָּרְסִי—Sep. *καμηλοπαρδαλῖς*—Vulg. *camelopardalus*—Michaëlis and Dathe retain the Heb. word *samar* or *femer*—We would write *zamer*.

I have not given the other antient versions, because they are mostly as doubtful as the original terms. The reader may see them in Bochart, or in Michaëlis *Supplementa ad Lex. Hebr.* I shall only give the six names as they are in the Greek of Venice, as they are yet less known than the others. Here they are: *Δερκας—αἰξ—αργαῖα—τραγος—μοουκρως—αργιολας—ζυραμφος*.

Ver. 7. *A divided cloven hoof*—דָּרְסִי דָּרְסִי דָּרְסִי. The word דָּרְסִי is wanting in the Sam. copy; nor was it read, it would appear, by Saadiah; nor, perhaps, by Jerom; who has only *et ungulum non findunt*. But it was read by all the other translators.

Ver. 8—12. See the Rem. on Leviticus 11.

Ver. 13. *And gledes*—דָּרְסִי. But the word is wanting in Sam. and in 4 mss. as well as in the P. P. Levit. 11. 14. Bochart imagined that it had been dropt out of the text of Leviticus, from its contiguity to a similar word דָּרְסִי. It is rendered by Sep. *קטו* or *קטרו* ‡—by Vulg. *mitus*. The three names in Gr. Ven. are *ῥις—κίττα—κόλιος*.

Ver. 16. *The ibis*—דָּרְסִי. I have followed the order of the Sam. copy, which is that of P. P. Levit. 11. 17. and of one (5) of Kennicott's mss. here. It is of very little importance.—For the rest see the Rem. on Leviticus.

* So Compl. Ald. Alex. with Copt. and the Ox. and Glasg. mss. The word is wanting in Sep. Rom. † I know not what induced Rosenmüller to say: "Alexandriai et Vulgatus vocabulum דָּרְסִי in versione prorsus omiserunt." It is true that there is nothing for it in the Roman edition; any more than for דָּרְסִי: but all the other editions, with the Oxford, Glasgow, Canon. and the Ambrosian Uncial mss. have *τραγελᾶφος*—and so the Coptic version: so that there is no doubt of this being the genuine reading of Sep. The Vulgate, in all the copies, has *tragelaphus*; which is only the Greek word latinized.

‡ By Rosenmüller it is said to be omitted by Sep. But this, I think, is a mistake. It is true, that in the 4 printed editions there is wanting one name; but that name, I think, corresponds with the Heb. דָּרְסִי; for which in the Oxford ms. there is *ῥις*, as in the Vulg. *ibis*. So that, admitting this to be genuine, there are in ver. 13. three names corresponding with the three Hebrew names: and that corresponding with דָּרְסִי will be *κίττα*, or, as other copies, *κίττα*.

CHAP. XV.

Ver. 1, 2, &c. MICHAELIS, in the third part of his *Mosaical Jurisprudence*, sect. 157. has laboured to prove that this release was only a respite during the sabbatical year; and that the creditor might the next year demand what was due to him: and his ideas have been adopted by Dathe and Rosenmüller. I cannot see how the text can bear this interpretation. I believe it was a real and absolute release; although it seems, from ver. 4. to be restricted to the poorer sort only. From the rich, I apprehend, the debt might be demanded*.

Ver. 14. *Ye shall load them with gifts*—וְהָעֶבֶד תַּעֲבִיד לֵה—by Montanus rendered, *torquem dando, torquem dabis ei*: a very intelligible version, surely! Our translators did well to abandon the letter here. They render: "Thou shalt furnish him liberally:" by which the sense is certainly expressed, but not the force of the Hebrew words; which indeed are not easily rendered into any modern tongue. The antients have generally metaphrased them. Sep. φοδων φοδωσεις αυτω—Vulg. *sed dabis viaticum*—Onk. אַפְרַסָּה חַפְרִישׁ לֵה—Syr. פִּרְשׁ דִּבְ לֵה—Saad. צִלָּה בְצִלָּה—Erp. וְהָעֶבֶד תַּעֲבִיד לֵה, *load him well*. And so Tharg. Bab. וְהָעֶבֶד תַּעֲבִיד לֵה: by Buxtorf after some Heb. scholiast, rendered, *exultando exultabitis eum*—in Pol. *onorando onorabitis eum*. But in this translation the word וְהָעֶבֶד is not expressed; and a more literal version would be, *collum ei onorando onorabitis*: and this, I have no doubt, is the true meaning of the Hebrew: Ye shall lay upon his neck, or shoulders, as great a load as it will bear; or, as I have rendered, *ye shall load him with gifts.*

Ver. 17. *And in like manner shall ye treat your female slaves*. It is a Jewish tradition, according to Delgado, that the female slave never had her ear bored; and that, consequently, "the whole paragraph speaks only of the law of the man servant; and the woman servant in ver. 12. is only mentioned to take notice, that she was to be furnished liberally, as in ver. 14. (to which these words refer) as well as the man servant." All this may be a Jewish tradition; but it appears not in the bond.

Ver. 18. *Seeing they have, in serving you six years, been doubly worth an hired servant*. The Heb. is: כִּי מִשְׁנֵה שָׂכָר עֶבֶד שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים—Sep. οτι επιμισθον μισθου του μισθωτου εδουλευσε σοι εξ ετη—*quoniam juxta mercedem mercenarii per sex annos servavit tibi*; neither of which seems to express the whole meaning of the original. Nor is it indeed easy to ascertain that meaning. The opinion of some Jewish interpreters, we learn from Jarhi, was, that the slave wrought for his master day and night, which an hired servant did not. But what was his nocturnal labour? Why, he lay with a female slave, to get young slaves for his master †.—Aben Ezra imagines

* Delgado, however, is of a different opinion, which is probably that of his brethren of the present day. He renders the words ver. 4. אֲמַן כִּי לֹא עָנִי בְּכֶם, *although there should be no poor among you*—with the following note: "The English translation implieth, that when there are no poor this law is suspended: which is not the case: for, if a rich man chooseth to avail himself of this law, he hath a right so to do: nay more, no person might make a demand on another after the commencement of this year: and should he offer to pay, the creditor was to tell him: *I release it*: nor could he take it unless the debtor said: *Notwithstanding this, I bid you take it*. So that this means, that this law should be in force, although there were no poor in the land."—In this interpretation I cannot possibly acquiesce. The Hebrew, in my opinion, will not bear such a meaning. † "Hinc dicunt: Servus Hebrewus servit tam die quam nocte; et hoc est duplum ejus, quo mercenarii diurni servant. Sed quænam est servitus nocturna? Dominus ejus tradit ei ancillam Chanaaneam, cujus liberi sunt illius domini." Jarhi ex verf. Breithaupti, vol. i. p. 1390.

that the common term of a hired servant was three years, which he infers from Isaiah xvi. 14. So that the slave, who served six years, did the double service of a mercenary: and this, I confess, is the most plausible explanation that I have met with. Le Clerc and Rosenmüller give indeed a more simple one: "eandem operam tibi navavit per sexennium, quam duo mercenarii navassent; et quod fecit, ad id præstandum duobus mercenariis opus fuisset: ac revera durior est conditio servi quam mercenarii, et major ab eo labor exigitur."

Ver. 20. *Every male firstling*, &c. I have elsewhere observed, that the word *every*, 73, must be here restrained to the prime of the firstlings; that is, to the single first-born of each kind: not to every first-born of every individual: otherwise the passage would clash with Numb. xv. 18. which, according to my explanation, it does not. See the Rem. on ch. 12.

CHAP. XVI.

Ver. 2. *WITH other offerings*. These words, which in my version I have put in Italics, are a necessary supplement. Delgado supplies *besides*, which comes to the same. It is evident that not only the paschal lamb but other paschal offerings are here included. The judicious Saadias has very properly supplied *וּמִזְבֵּחַ*, and *with it*.

Ver. 8. *A festival to the Lord*—עֲצֵרַת לַיהוָה—Sep. *εσθνη κυριου*—Vulg. *collecta est Domini*: by the Douay translators rendered, "the collection of our Lord," without any note to explain its meaning—and so the French of Frizon, *la collecte du Seigneur*: but Saçi and Calmet more judiciously paraphrase: "parceque ce sera le jour de l'assemblée solennelle instituée en l'honneur du Seigneur." The last German translators of the Vulgate, more literally: "eine versammlung."—Onk. כִּנְסָה—Syr. כְּנֻשָּׁה—both denoting *an assembly*—and so equivalently Tharg. and Arab. Erp.—Saad. כְּנֻשָּׁה, *an abiding*, at the sanctuary—Sam. ver. 17, of the same import with the Greek *εσθνη*—Perf. retains the Heb. word—and Gr. Ven. has, as in Leviticus, *καταμνησθαι*. So much for the antients.—Of modern versions, I shall notice only that of our English translators. Our common version has, after the Genevans, "a solemn assembly;" and in the margin *refrains*. Our older versions have "gathering together"—Purver, "a solemn day"—Bate follows the common version: but Delgado would have us render, *a day of detention from work*; and this is the explication of Jarhi* and other Rabbins. Delgado's note is: "In ver. 7, he bids them go to their tents, the morning after the passover: how, then, can this mean *a solemn assembly*? The Hebrew word means *desertion from work*†." But in the supposition that they went home, on the morning after the paschal sacrifice, they might return on the seventh day to hold *an assembly to the Lord*: not to say that, according to some interpreters; the morning here mentioned is the morning after the seventh day; which I think hardly probable‡.

In my version of Levit. 23. 36. I have rendered it, with our common version, *an assembly day*: but, as I am not sure if the people actually assembled on that day, I have here followed Sep. and the Samaritan version; and used a general term, which is suited to either hypothesis: for they might keep *a festival to the Lord*, either at home or at the sanctuary. Were I to draw

* Who gives, however, another: namely, *as assembly*.

the next comma would be superfluous.

sacer Jova.

† But if it signified, in itself, *a desertion from work*;

‡ Michaëlis's version is "cin hochei festag Jehova." Dathe's, *die*

the meaning of the Heb. term from the common signification of its radical form, I would render it *a shutting-up day: dies feriata*.—For the rest, of the two additions of “any,” כל, and “servile,” עבדתי, which are in the Sam. copy; the former is supported by several Hebrew mss. and by Sep. and Syr.: the latter by both Sam. versions; and by Sep. although they paraphrase thus: *πᾶσι ὅσα ποιεῖται ψυχῇ*.

Ver. 10. Archbishop Secker very properly bids us efface the words in Italic in our common version of this verse: *unto the Lord thy God*. They are evidently a superfluous eke.

Ver. 13. *The festival of booths, or tabernacles*, is thus kept by the Jews of Aleppo. “The tabernacles are variously constructed, and disposed in different situations, according to the size and other conveniences of the house. They are sometimes placed upon the small terraces in the front of the upper rooms; but most commonly in the court-yards: sometimes on the flat tops of houses. The ordinary method of building them is by fastening to the corners of a wooden *divan* four slender erect posts; which serve to support on all sides a reticulated work of green reeds; a small place only in the front being left for the entrance. This work on the outside is covered with fresh myrtle; and is hung on the inside with cbintz or burdet hangings. The roof is thatched with reeds not stript of their leaves: and the best cushions and carpets are employed to dress the divan. These divans have the advantage of being easily moved; and two or more may be joined together. In some of the principal houses a permanent wooden *kiosk*, built upon a stone *mustaby*, in the middle of the court, is made to serve the purpose; which, being already latticed, is easily covered with reeds and myrtle branches. There is still another method used, in order to avoid the litter of withered leaves. This is by erecting a temporary booth, consisting of slight posts, papered over, and wreathed from top to bottom with flakes of cotton: hangings supply the place of walls; and the whole is roofed with mats.” Ruffel’s Aleppo, vol. ii. p. 69.

CHAP. XVII.

Ver. 3. *WHICH I have forbidden*. The Heb. hath, “which I have not commanded”—*וְאֵלֶּיךָ לֹא אָמַר*. But this is a common *meiotical* Hebraism, which denotes strict prohibition; and ought to be rendered prohibitively.

Ver. 9. *Who will inquire, and make known to you*. The present Heb. has *וְהָיָה חֵדְוֶךָ לָּךְ*, *thou shalt inquire, and they will make known to thee*: or, as elegantly Dathe: *Hos consulite; bi de jure vobis respondebunt*. I have followed the Sam. lection *וְהָיָה חֵדְוֶךָ לָּךְ*; which was that of Sep. *καὶ ἐκζητήσατε ἀποκριθήσονται σοι*. But all the other versions down to Gr. Ven. inclusively read in the second person.

CHAP. XVIII.

Ver. 3. *A SHOULDER, the two cheeks, and the marrow*—Heb. *חֻמְרֵי חֻמְרֵי חֻמְרֵי*—Sep. *תֹּרֶם בִּשְׁפָּרְמָה, וְכֵן תִּשְׁפָּרְמָה, וְכֵן תִּשְׁפָּרְמָה*—Vulg. has only *armum et ventriculum*: but all the other

* So also Josephus: but Philo *ὑψιστον*, and so it is written in Pollux: but Gr. Ven. has here *εὐσπον*; and agrees also in the other terms with Sep.

versions have three different terms. Delgado observes, "that Scripture explains in one place what is omitted in another: so that the two *cheeks* and the *maw*, mentioned here, may be added in Levit. 7. 34. and the *breast* mentioned there may be understood here." But this is surely an odd manner of *adding*, and *understanding*. I rather think that this is a distinct precept; as I have said in my Explanatory Note.

Ver. 8. *He shall eat*. The present Heb. followed by most of the antient versions, has *אכלו*, *they shall eat*: but preferable, in my opinion, is the reading of Sam. *אכל*, followed by Sep. *φαγετω*. For the rest, Sep. seem to have read *כחלק* instead of *בחלק*, as they render *μερίδι μαινερωμεν*. The meaning of the last comma of this verse, *לבר מצותי על דמיון*, is contested. Aben-Ezrah, followed by our English translators, gives to *לבר* its common signification *beside*: "but I cannot (says Delgado) say that I approve of this explanation: for, how could it be supposed, that the eating of the sacrifice should affect his patrimony? It should be observed, that *לבר* means *except* as well as *besides*; and so Raschy * renders it: and this refers to a mutual agreement, the priests made among themselves, to be divided into classes, and to serve weekly by turns; and that class, whose turn it was to be left out, is hereby excluded from it: and, as it was an agreement with their own consent, Scripture terms it by the denomination of a *sale*, as they had a better share of it when it was their turn to serve, they being then less in number on that account."—Hence he translates, *except their condescensions by the fathers*. I confess I understand not this: nor can I see how the words of the text will bear such a meaning.—But let us see how the antients understood it. Sep. *ולא תהיה תרומתו* † *της πατρως*—Aquila *ולא תהיה תרומתו* *αυτου επι της πατρως*—Sym. *ολα της πατρως* *εκαυτος* (read *εκαυτου*) *της πατρως*—Vulg. *excepto eo, quod in urbe sua ex paterna ei successione debetur*: where the word *excepto* has evidently the same meaning with *præter*.—Onk. and the Thargum of Jonathan paraphrase much to the purport of Raschi, Jarhi, and Delgado—Syr. most briefly and literally, but not very intelligibly, *בסדר כן ובכח דמיון*—Saad. *בכח דמיון* *אלא כן*—*beside what the fathers have ordained concerning succession*; the paraphrase of a text, which he was probably at a loss to understand—Esp. very literally *ולא תהיה תרומתו*—Perf. favours the common interpretation of the Rabbins—and Gr. Ven. has *επι των πατρων αυτου επι των πατρων*.—All these versions, the intelligent reader will perceive, are but so many various conjectures, or verbal renderings, which have no explicit meaning: and, indeed, it is hard to give a clear and explicit meaning out of the Hebrew words. I have rendered them as literally as I could, and in the signification which I deemed the most probable. I subjoin Rosenmüller's scholium: "Per *venditiones* intelligi debent possessiones venales, possessiones ex quæ parentum fuerunt; ob idque et ab iis vendi poterant. Etsi enim fundos ad agriculturam, vineas, oliveta Levitæ non possiderent, habebant tamen urbes suas, in quibus domos possidere poterant, greges et armenta aliæque mobilia: itemque juxta urbem agros compascuos ad jumentorum pabula: quæ omnia successione ad posteros transibant."—The version of Dathc is: *præter vendita a se de bonis paternis*—That of Michaëlis: "das ungerechnet, was er noch als familien-deputat verkanfen kann."

* He might have added Jarhi; who also talks of a sort of convention between the priests: "Et vendiderunt alter alteri (dicendo) *Tolle tu sabbatum tuum; et ego tollam sabbatum meum.*" † The Complutenian adds *αυτου*: but it was not read by Austin in the old Ital. version. See Sabatier.

Ver. 10. *A fortune-teller*—קסם קסמים—Sep. *μαρτυρομαχος μαρτυρος*—Vulg. *qui ariolos sciscitetur*—Onk. and Tharg. Chaldaize the Heb. words—Syr. קסם קסא, equivalent terms—and so also Sam ver.—Saad. מנחם תנחומות, *an astrologer*—Arab. Erp. *يَسْتَفِلُّ اسْتِفَالًا*, *qui auguratur augurium*—Gr. Ven. *μαρτυρων μαρτυρας*—Thus the antients.

Michaëlis thought it means an *haruspex*, who takes omens from the entrails of animals, and renders accordingly “*der aus den engeweiden der thiere wahrſaget*”—Dathe, *qui fortilegia exercet*.—Rosenmüller is of opinion, that it denotes that sort of divination which the Greeks called *βελουμαντις*; which, as we learn from Tacitus, was in use also among the Germans. “*Illud ipsum autem fortilegium apud Arabes quoque usitatum fuisse docet nos Pocokius, in Specim. Hist. Arab. p. 328, 329. Ut dum aliquid obeundum sit magni momenti, tres sagittas includant vasculo; quarum uni inscriptum אמני רבי, jussit me Dominus; alterי נרמני רבי, prohibuit me Dominus; tertia nulla nota fuerit insignita. Extrahentibus sagittas, si occurreret quæ juberet, rem aggressos supersticiosos; si quæ vetaret, quieviſſe; si ~~αγγελλομαχος~~, repetiſſe, donec prodiret quæ vel interdiceret vel præciperet. Hujus fortilegii vestigium deprehendimus in ipsa radice קסם, nam Arabibus in conjug. roma est voluit ut partitio fieret sagittarum jactu.*” Rosenmüller *in loc.* I deemed it better to use a general term: as the radical meaning of קסם is not easily ascertainable.

Ib. *An augur*—מנחם—by Sep. rendered *αλεγεινισμος*—by Vulg. *qui observet somnia*. The Heb. word seems evidently to denote one who takes auguries from the clouds. See the Remark on Levit. 19. 26.

Ib. *A diviner*—מנחם. It seems to denote one who divines by means of serpents*.—Sep. however have a general term: *αυριζομαχος*—Vulg. *qui observet auguria*—Dathe, *augur*—Rosenmüller, *auspex*.

Ib. *A forcerer*—מכשף—Sep. *φαρμακος*—Vulg. *maleficus*—Dathe, *veneficus*. The word is, with some probability, supposed to denote that sort of sorcery which fascinates the eyes: hence Michaëlis renders: “*Der mondfinsternissen machen will.*”—Rosenmüller on Exod. 7. 11. thinks it is to be derived from the Arabic *مخفي*, *abscondit*; and would render *rerum arcanarum peritus*. But none of the antients favour this version: and a *forcerer*, on the whole, seems to be the most eligible term.—The last three words in this verse are in Gr. Ven. rendered *αποκαταστασει*—*καταστασει*—*καταστασει*.

Ver. 11. *An incanter*—חבר חבר—by Montanus rendered *jungens junctionem*: that is, according to some Jewith interpreters, either *joining* together certain incantatory verses, or *collecting* a certain number of serpents. The latter idea pleased Michaëlis and Dathe. But Rosenmüller sends us to the Arab signification of חבר, *scripsit, peritus fuit*. I doubt, however, if this be not but a secondary meaning of the word, like the Latin *lego*, in the sense of *reading*. I would stick to the common meaning of חבר, and say that חבר חבר was one who composed magical *spells* or *incantations*†; which are sometimes called also *ligaments*; especially when they are employed to prevent connubial enjoyments. It is remarkable that the Sam. version has two words that literally denote a *tier of ligaments*; אמר אמרים. The complaint of impotency from this cause is still a common complaint in Arabia. See Niebuhr, and other travellers into the East.

* And so Michaëlis renders: “*Der aus schlangen wahrſaget.*”
 ונחש—Vulg. *incantator*—Gr. Ven. *φαρμακιστων φαρμακισται*.

† The Septuagint version is: *σταυρων σταυρων*.

Ib. *A necromancer*—חַוִּי נֶחֱמָנִים—by Montanus rendered *interrogans Pythones*—Sep. and Gr. Ven. *εργασκουδος*—Vulg. *qui Pythones consultat*: followed by Dathe, *consultans pythones*.—So our common version, “a consulter with familiar spirits.”—But it would appear from 1 Sam. 28. 8 and 19. that חַוִּי was a *necromancer*. Yet, as חַוִּי נֶחֱמָנִים seems to denote that more properly, perhaps it were better to render *ventriloquist* with Sep. In my Explan. Note I have said, that I take the latter term, *a consulter of the dead*, to be only an interpretation of the former: but the intervention of another word, נֶחֱמָנִים, which has unaccountably been omitted in my version, makes this supposition untenable. Please then to reform my translation of ver. 17. thus: “Or an incanter, or a pythonist, or a wizard, or a consulter of the dead,”—or “necromancer.”

Ver. 15. *A prophet like me*—נָבִיא כְּמֹשֶׁה. The words *like me* are not to be considered as a comparison of parity between Moses and his successors; but that *they, as well as he*, were to be raised by God out of their own people and nation. For the rest, although the writers of the New Testament have accommodated this passage to Jesus Christ; yet the series of Moses's speech cannot be reconciled with such an interpretation; unless in a figurative and mystical meaning. The reasoning of Dathe is so just, that I cannot help laying it before my readers. “Sub hoc propheta non unus aliquis intelligendus, sed prophetae in genere omnes, quos Deus sequentibus temporibus voluntatis suae interpretes ad Israelitas fit missurus: quem sensum, quantum ego quidem intelligo, contextus planè docet. 1. Interdixit Moses, ver. præcedente, populo, ne hariolos, &c. adiret: rationem addit, in hoc ver. quod Deus eis ex sua gente prophetas suae voluntatis interpretes perpetuo mittere vellet. 2. Nulla esset vis in verbis Moses ad cavendam illam superstitionem, nisi promittat Messiam statim post mortem suam venturum*. 3. Nexus cum ver. 20, 21, 22, in quibus docetur qua ratione ab illis veris Dei prophetis pseudoprophetae sint discernendi.—Perperam nonnulli interpretes urgent illud כְּמֹשֶׁה sicuti ego; cum negetur Deut. 35. 10. prophetam Mosi similem extitisse. Male enim ab eis illud כְּמֹשֶׁה extenditur ad omnes Moses prerogativas. Propheta Mosi similis intelligitur talis: cui Deus suam voluntatem patefaciat, et qui eam ad populum summa fide referat, uti Moses haec fecerat.” This mode of explaining and limiting the meaning of כְּמֹשֶׁה is also urged by Delgado: but I think it more probable, as I have already said, that the comparison is in the succeeding prophets being, like Moses, of the Israelitic nation. The construction of the words appears to me to point to that meaning. Moses seems to say: The Lord will raise up to you a prophet out of your own brethren, *as I am*: and perhaps כְּמֹשֶׁה would be better so rendered. Montanus's most literal version is: *Prophetam, ex interiori tuo et ex fratribus tuis sicut ego, suscitabit tibi Dominus*.—On the whole, then, I am strongly inclined to believe that the comparison lies purely in this: Consult not the soothsayers and fortune-tellers of the neighbouring nations, which is abominable to the Lord, but apply to prophets of your own nation, such as I am.—Hence, when Ahaziah sent to consult the god of Ekron about the issue of his sickness, Elias says: “Is it for want of a God in Israel, that ye are going to consult Beelzebub, the god of

* Indeed, it is hard to conceive, how any person, who but runs and reads, can find here the promise of a distant prophet, or Messiah. For, as Rosenmüller observes, what sort of argument would this be? Consult not augurs and fortune-tellers, &c. for the Lord your God will *some hundred years after my death* raise up a prophet, like me, to whom ye shall hearken.

"Ekron?"—To obviate the objection to his interpretation, which might be drawn from Acts 3. 23. and 7. 37. Dathe continues thus: "Cum hac explicatione citatio hujus loci in N. Testamento, et applicatio ejus ad Messiam bene potest conciliari, si teneamus, id quod adeo Calovius contra Grotium disputans concessit, multa Vet. Testamenti loca præter sensum proximè intentum, (literalem vocant) habere quoque sensum sublimiorem. Igitur hæc verba maximè propriè de Messia possunt intelligi, et in eo sunt impleta: quippe ille fuit verissimus ille a Deo missus propheta ex populo Judaico, cujus contemptum quoque Deus severè puniit."—Rosenmüller, who adopts the rest of Dathe's annotation, is wisely silent on this part of it. Whatever were the ultimate views of Providence, and however well the words may be accommodated to Jesus Christ, I believe Moses never thought of such an accommodation.

CHAP. XIX.

NOTHING could be wiser than the regulations contained in this chapter; in which there occurs hardly any grammatical difficulty. See Rem. on Numbers, ch. 25.—The three cities of refuge here mentioned are not, according to Delgado, the same with those mentioned in ch. 4. 41. but cities "that were never set apart as yet, though they will be at the future restoration."

CHAP. XX.

Ver. 4. *AND to save you.* The copulative is wanting in the present Heb. which has only וְלִדְרֹשׁ: but the Sam. text and version, with Sep.* Syr. and Saad. have the copulative וְלִדְרֹשׁ; which I have followed in my version.

Ver. 15. Although the addition in this verse, "whose land," &c. be only in Sep. and Vulg. I have no doubt of its having originally stood in the text. The comma has been dropt out, in transcribing, from its contiguity to the repetition in the beginning of next verse.—The same has happened to the copies of Sep. with respect to the repetition; which is wanting in the Vatican and some other mss. as the preceding comma is wanting in Ald. Comp. and Alex.

Ver. 19. This is confessedly a most difficult passage, and has accordingly been variously interpreted. The Heb. is תָּצוּר אֶל עִיר יִשָּׁם רַבִּים לֶחֶם עָלֶיהָ לְחַפְשָׁהּ לֹא תַשְׁתֵּן אֶת עֵצָהּ לְנֹדָה כִּי תִצְרֶהּ בְּמִצְרָה; by Montanus literally rendered: *Cum coarctaveris civitatem diebus multis pugnando super eam ad captandum eam, non corrumpes lignum ejus impellendo super illud securim; quia ex illo comedes, et illud non succides: quia homo, lignum agri, ad veniendum a faciebus tuis in coarctationem*—by our last English translators: "When thou shalt besiege a city a long time, in making war against it, to take it; thou shalt not destroy the trees thereof, by forcing an axe against them: for thou mayest eat of them, and thou shalt not cut them down (for the tree of the field is man's life) to employ

* That is, Ald. Comp. Alex. with the Oxford and Glasg. mss. And so read Copt. and Austin in the ant. Italic. The Roman ed. has not the copulative.—For the rest, there is here another var. reading in the copies of Sep.—Ald. and Comp. with the Oxford ms. have *dizawru*: and so read Austin: but Alex. and Glasg. have the true reading, *zaw dizawru*. So Copt. † Sam. על. ‡ Sam. תִּצְרֶהּ.

"them in the siege*."—The whole difficulty lies in these few words: **וְהָאֲדָמָה עַץ הַשָּׂדֶה לִבְנוֹת מִצָּרִיךְ**—rendered by Sep. *μη ἀβήματος το ξύλον το α τφ αγρου, επελθεισ απο προσωπου σου εις τω χαρσικαι*—Vulg. *Quoniam lignum est, et non homo; nec potest bellantium contra te augere numerum.*—Equivalent is the version of Onkelos, and in some measure that of Syr. Thag. both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven. whose version is *οτι αδ' αβηματος το ξυλον του αγρου, ως εβηματο απο προσωπου σου εις την παληορικαν.*—To come now to the moderns: Le Clerc, with some prior commentators (who may be seen in Pole), took the prefix **ו** before **אָדָם** to be an interrogative; and renders "nam an arbor agri homo est?" for which he is, as usual, reproved by Houbigant, who, perhaps too roundly, asserts that an interrogative **ו** after **כ** is repugnant to the genius of the Hebrew language. He adds, that the Masoretes themselves were of his opinion; as they point with a *kametz*, not with a *katēph-patach*. But Houbigant, in my apprehension, is wrong, when he at the same time asserts that the antients instead of **אָדָם** must have read **אָדָם לֹא**; because they render with a negative particle. It is well known that they often changed, and properly changed, the interrogative into a negative: and, in fact, *Is man a tree?* is, in Hebrew phraseology, equipollent to *Man is not a tree.*—But there is a greater objection against Le Clerc's, and even Houbigant's version †. The reason assigned by Moses, why fruit-trees should not be cut down, is not, lest they should become *men*, and join the besieged (a frigid puerile conceit); but merely because they *are* fruit-trees, which afford food to man. The parenthesis then, in question, must be explained by the context, that precedes and follows it: and both lead us to seek the meaning which was adopted by James's translators, and which I have followed in my version: only, for the sake of perspicuity, I have, with the Genevans, put the parenthesis at the end of the verse, where, in English, it ought to be. So elegantly Dathe, after Frommann: *Igitur eas ne succidite, ut illis ad obsidionem utamini: hominum enim usus a Deo destinatus sunt.*—In my Explan. Note I have observed, that if the words **עַץ הַשָּׂדֶה** (trees of the field) denote only *barren*, or rather *forest*, trees, the explication of Tympius, adopted by Rosenmüller §, would be extremely probable, taken by itself: but with what precedes and follows it is not in my opinion reconcileable.—The only objection that can be made to our common version, which I have followed, is, that there wants a **ל** before **הָאָדָם**: but this, although not a common, is however an ellipsis, of which several examples may be seen in Tympius; and particularly in the word **אָדָם**. I shall quote only Prov. 20. 25. Eccles. 12. 13. and Ezek. 12. 10.

Ver. 20. *Until it be subdued*—**עַד שֶׁיִּדְּבַח**—by Montanus rendered, *donec domineris ei*: and so equivalently all the ant. translators, save Sep. who considered **דָּבַח** not as the 2d person sing. active; but as the infinitive with the affix **ו**, and render *εως ου παραδοθη*: which, with our last translators, I have followed.

* This version they borrowed from the Genevans; but, in my opinion, did not improve it. They did well, indeed, to put the words "for the tree of the field is man's life" in a parenthesis: but if they had, with the Genevans, transposed it to the end of the verse, the meaning would have been clearer.—Our more antient versions generally follow the Septuagint.—Purver, after scouting the common versions, gives us his own in these words: "So shalt not cut them down (because the trees of the field are for man) to go from before thee into the siege."—Similar is Bate's translation.

† *Neque enim est homo arbor agri, ut hac se contra te vallo muniat*: followed by Michaëlis. § "*Sunt enim, O homo! arbores agrestes, quibus ad obsidionem uti potes. Hæc hujus commatis interpretatio mihi videtur facillima, et totius orationis nexui aptissima.*"

CHAP. XXI.

Ver. 4. *SOME ever-flowing torrents*—נָחַל אֲרָן—Sep. *φαιερὴν ποταμὸν*—Vulg. *vallem asperam atque saxosam*—Onk. נָחַל בִּיר—and so equivalently Tharg. and Arab. Erp.—Saadias has a word equivalent to that of Sep. נָחַל—but Perf. and Gr. Ven. stick more closely to the radical meaning of the Heb. the former having נָחַל, *a strong stream*; the latter, *χειμαρρὸν ποταμὸν*. Both these terms are certainly more expressive of the meaning, than either *a rough or rugged valley**. I have no doubt of נָחַל אֲרָן being here *a brook that never dries, torrents perennis*, and consequently cannot be laboured. See the Arab. وَرْد, and its derivatives: or Michaëlis's *Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* p. 1189.

Ver. 7. *Our hands have not shed.* The present text has שָׁפַךְ: a real solecism, which the Keri bids us remove, and read שָׁפַח. But Schultens, Glassius, and even Rosenmüller, defend the present reading, and bring doubtful examples to support it. But why have recourse to such subterfuges, when not only the Keri, but all the Sam. copies and 6 or 7 Heb. mss. have the regular and proper word, שָׁפַח?

Ver. 12. *Pare her nails*—שָׁרַח אֶת צַיְתֶיהָ—lit. *faciet ungues suos*; in the same sense, I presume, as the French say *faire la barbe* for *to shave the beard*. In this sense the Heb. word was understood by Sep. Vulg. Syr. Tharg.—But Onk. both Arabs, and Perf. have words that denote quite the contrary, namely, *to nourish the nails*, and *let them grow*, instead of paring them†. And this meaning is preferred by Dathe and Rosenmüller‡: because the woman was to give signs of mourning: “quoniam mulier signa luctus edere debebat.”—But if *shaving the head* was a sign of mourning, why might not *paring the nails*? Or, *vice versa*, if *nourishing the nails* were a sign of mourning, one would think that *nourishing the hair* should be equally so.—Delgado's observation on this passage is to me not very intelligible: “These injunctions (says he) laid on a heathen woman taken captive, before she be taken to wife, are certainly meant *to render her disagreeable to him*: therefore I should think *Let her nails grow* is much properer than to pare them: besides, she would pare them without any injunction, and the Hebrew may bear one sense as well as the other.”—Here is a postulate, which cannot easily be granted; and an inference, which seems badly drawn. Why should the injunction be made, to render the woman disagreeable? or, how would paring the nails have that effect?—For the rest, I doubt very much, if the Heb. will bear *one sense as well as the other*.

Ver. 14. *Nor make a slave of her.* The Heb. word מָכַר, which occurs only here and again in chap. 24. 7. has been variously rendered—By Sep. *adherere*—Vulg. *opprimere per potentiam*—and so equivalently Onkelos.—But the other ant. interpreters seem to have considered it as almost synonymous to the preceding מָכַר—and so our common version, “thou shalt not make

* The former is our common version, followed by Bate; the latter that of Purver. Delgado corrects our common version thus—*into a rough stream*; which corresponds with Perf. and Gr. Ven. He justly observes, that as the ceremony was to be “performed over a place that had never been tilled or sown, a river that hath a strong stream is chosen: for “there we are certain that it could never have been measured; which cannot be ascertained of a rough valley.”—What he adds, namely, that נָחַל never signifies any thing else than *a river or brook*, is not so well. † Gr. Ven. most literally: *μαρτυρεῖ τα τοῦς οὐγκας αὐτῆς*—*she shall do her nails*: and, I think, we sometimes use a similar mode of phrasing. ‡ But Michaëlis follows Sep. Vulg. &c. “ihre nigel abschneiden.”

"merchandise of her;" followed by Purver—Bate: "thou shalt not make any advantage of her."—Delgado imagines that the meaning may be ~~learned~~ from עֶמְקָהּ בָּר in Ruth 2. 15. and would render: "thou shalt not make a parcel of her for sale."—But as this makes a sort of tautology with the foregoing comma, I think we must seek some other meaning in the kindred dialects. Now not only in Chald. and Arab. עֶמְקָהּ has the meaning of *servio, ministro, &c.* but in the Sam. dialect it denotes *subjicio, in servitutem redigo, dominari*: so that Jerom has not badly paraphrased the whole colon: *nec vendere poteris pecuniam, nec opprimere per potentiam*: but the Greek of Venice is here peculiarly happy, *οὐκ ὑπερκενήσῃς αὐτήν*. I have no doubt of this being the real meaning.

Ver. 15. This and the two following verses contain the only Mosaic law respecting polygamy; which, at first sight, might seem to stint the husband to *two* wives: but there is here no formal limitation, and the Hebrew nation never understood that there was a prohibition to marry more than two. With respect to the natural lawfulness of polygamy, about which so much has of late been written, it principally depends on the question whether, in general, more females are born than males; and whether, in some climates and countries, more females are born than in other climes and countries. If we can trust Bruce (vol. i. p. 284), in Mesopotamia, Armenia, Syria, from Mosul to Aleppo and Antioch, the proportion is fully *two* women to *one* man. In his progress southward, he found the proportion of females increase; and from Suez to the straits of Babelmandel, which contains the three Arabias, the proportion was fully *four* women to *one* man*: "which proportion (adds he) I have reason to believe, holds as far as the line and 30 degrees beyond it."—But according to the report of a Maronite priest, employed to number those of his nation at Aleppo in 1740, their number was found to be 3033; of whom 1500 were males, and 1553 females. Although Dr. Ruffel did not entirely rely on the accuracy of this report, he is inclined to think, that the disproportion of males to females, at Aleppo, is not so considerable as it appeared to Bruce. See note 79 to vol. i. of Aleppo, p. 440.

Ver. 20. *A profligate*—וְהָיָה—Sép. συμφορονομικῶς—Vulg. *qui commensationibus vacat*—Onk. and Gr. Ven. make him a *flesh-devourer*, *κρεωφάγος*—and our English translators, *a glutton*.—The word has a more indefinite meaning, and denotes a base, vile, abandoned *profligate*; vulgarly a *blackguard*.

Ver. 23. *A hanging corpse*. There is in the Heb. only תָּלוּ; or, as Sam. תָּלָא; or, as 4 Sam. mss. תָּלוּ, *suspensus*. But Sep. has *ὡς κρεμασμένος ἐπὶ ξύλου*—Vulg. *qui pendet in ligno*: and so the comma is quoted by Paul, Galat. 3. 13. But there is no vestige of *ἐπὶ ξύλου* in any other version, not even the Syriac: and this is an instance, against Dr. Kennicott, of the insufficiency of a New-Testament quotation, to be alone a secure authority for correcting the text of the Old Testament. Paul quoted the Septuagint as he found it in the Hellenistic synagogues, without giving himself any trouble to compare it with the original; with which, perhaps, he was little acquainted; for we know that a Jew of that day might be a learned, a very learned man, and yet but slightly acquainted with the Hebrew language: witness Philo.—For the rest, the *curse* here mentioned falls, not on the person for merely *hanging* on the wood; but for having merited that death: as was very properly understood by Onk. Syr. Saadias.

* It was this, perhaps, that induced the Arabic Prophet to limit polygamy to *four* wives.

CHAP. XXII.

Ver. 9. *YOUR vineyards*—כרם—Sep. *τον αμπελων*—Vulg. *vineam*—and equivalently all the other versions, except Syr. which has כרוב, *thy tilled field*. Did the translator read here, as in Levit. 19. 19. שדך? or gave he to כרם a different meaning? One is apt to think that שד, and not כרם, was in both places the original reading: for we *sow* a field, but *plant* a vineyard. Nor is the verb זרע, *to sow*, any where else, I think, applied to a vineyard; but always the verb נטע, *to plant*. The best mode of reconciling all is to say, either that כרם is here, as well as in some other places, to be taken in a general meaning, and denotes any *fertile tilled field*; and is equivalent to שדך; (see Rem. on Levit. 2. 14.) or that the precept goes to forbid the sowing of seeds of any kind in a vineyard, amongst the vines; and this, indeed, seems inferable from what follows: “lest ye profane the whole crop,” &c. Where note, that the word rendered *profane* is קדש, which has a double meaning, *to sanctify*, and *to profane*; as ברכך, *to bless*, and *to curse*: although, properly speaking, the radical meaning is neither the one nor the other.—See Rem. on Ps. 16. 3. and Job 1. 5.

Ver. 12. *Tie-strings*—נזלים, or rather נזלים, as it is in 15 MSS.—by Sep. very properly rendered στρεπτα, and by Vulg. *funiculos*. These *strings* or *ribbons* were, I conceive, to tie the *coverlet* to the *bed-posts*: which might be deemed the more necessary, as a whole family often slept in one chamber, on different beds; and these only covered with a single rug. See *Harmer's Observations*, vol. i. p. 165.

Ver. 13. “This law (says Delgado) seems, at first sight, to be contradictory to that in Exodus, chap. xxii. ver. 15. [16.] where it appears to be no crime for a single woman to lie “with a man; the man only is punished by a pecuniary fine: and as for the deceit, that never “could be punished with death: so that this must mean, that her husband proves that she lost “her virginity after she had been betrothed to him; which is a capital offence, as appears by “ver. 23.”—This is an odd way of reasoning. How was the husband to prove that his wife had lost her virginity after being betrothed to him, unless he knew her to be a virgin before that period? The crime is evidently to be placed to the deceit practised upon the husband.—To what I have said on this law, in my Explanatory Note, I have only to add, that they who wish to see the matter physically and theologically discussed, may consult Buffon, and more especially, Michaëlis's *Mosaical Jurisprudence*, vol. ii. sect. 92. See also Arvieux *Des Mœurs des Arabes*, and Niebuhr *Description de l'Arabie*.

Ver. 15. Among the Mohammedans, the tokens of virginity are shown by the bride's mother, to any of the females who choose to see them, but to none of the men, save the bridegroom. See Notes and Illustrations to Ruffel's *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 433.

Ver. 18. *And chastise him*—וְנָתַתּוֹ—Sep. *ταυδευσαντι αυτον*—and so Gr. Ven.—but Vulg. *verberabunt illum*: in which sense it was understood by Onk. Targ. and Josephus; who says that the punishment was 39 stripes—*ταλπηγας τριακαινοντα, μιας λεπτοσσης*. Ant. lib. iv. c. 8. No. 23. p. 241. This is the common opinion of the Jewish commentators. But it seems more probable, that the chastisement was an arbitrary one, not exceeding, however, the number of 40 stripes, according to the law ch. 25. 3.—Some think that the Hebrew word means, here, only

only to rebuke, reprimand.—For the rest, the Samaritan text has *וַיִּשְׁמַע* after *וַיִּשְׁמַע*, which is more express and emphatical; and is the reading of one of Kennicott's mss.

Ver. 21. A considerable number of Heb. and Chald. mss. have *ALL the men of her own city*—*כָּל אֲנָשֵׁי*.

Ib. *By playing the harlot in her father's house*—*לְנוֹת בֵּית אָבִיהָ*. But the Samaritan reading is *לְנוֹת אֶת בֵּית אָבִיהָ*—and Sep. *ἐπὶ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς*—Vulg. *ut fornicaretur in domo patris sui*—Gr. Ven. *τῷ πατρὶ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς*—and so equivalently the other versions.

C H A P. XXIII.

Ver. 1. al. 2. *NO man deprived, &c.* The Heb. is *פְּצוֹעַ דָּכָא וְכָרֹת שֶׁכֶּבֶד*—by Montanus rendered, *læsus attritione, et abscissione veretris*—and by our English translators, “He that is wounded in the stones, or hath his privy member cut off.”—So, but more paraphrastically, Vulg. *eunuchus attritis vel amputatis testiculis, et [vel] abscisso veretro*—Sep. more concisely, *ἁλῶδης αὐδὲ ἀποκακομμένος*—Gr. Ven. *τομῆς ἁλῶδης, καὶ τετραμμένος τὴν σαρφύραν*.—All the other versions are nearly confimular; except Syr. which for the four Heb. words has only *גִּירָא*, *an adulterer!*

Ib. *Into the society of the Lord*—*בְּקִרְיָ יְהוָה*—Sep. *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ Κυρίου*—Vulg. *in ecclesiam Domini*.—The meaning of which, in this and the following verses, according to Bishop Law and some other commentators, is, “that such persons are not to be admitted to officiate or be in the magistracy.”—I am more inclined to believe, with Tharg. that matrimonial connections are forbidden. The observation of Delgado appears to be just: “*Not to enter into the congregation of the Lord*, must mean not to marry an Hebrew woman: for it would be uncharitable to debar any body from becoming a member of the congregation, if he be persuaded that theirs is the true religion: and that this phrase signifies an intermarriage, may be learned from Genesis, ch. 34. 16. *Then we will give our daughters unto you, and we will take your daughters unto us, and we will become one people*—which shows that intermarrying consolidates an alien with the nation.”

Ver. 2. *A mamser*—*מַמְזֵר*. Variouslly understood and rendered. Sep. *αὐτῶν*—Vulg. *de scorto natus*—and so literally Tharg. *רַמְזִילִי מִן עֹרֵי*—Onk. retains the Heb. word—Syr. *גִּירָא*—Saad. *מְזֻנָּה*—Erp. *פֶּרֶן מְזֻנָּה*, *a whore's bird*.—Perf. retains the Heb. word—Gr. Ven. *υἱος*.—All agree in this, that *מַמְזֵר* is *a spurious child, born of a prostitute*. Michaëlis was not pleased with this meaning, and sought another in *מִזְרָם*, *macula peregrini*: i. e. *peregrinus infamis*, as Dathe, who adopts Michaëlis's conjecture, renders. One of Kennicott's mss. appeared to them to favour this meaning; as that ms. has *מִזְרָם*. But this seems to me a feeble aid: and I see no reason to depart from the antients. Delgado, however, who most probably never read Michaëlis, makes a similar conjecture. He thinks that *מַמְזֵר*, from *זָר** *an alien*, signifies *one of a strange nation*, but adds: “I give this as a conjecture of my own, though the traditional explanation of the Rabbins contradicts it; for they say that *מַמְזֵר* means *a natural son begotten*

* It may be questioned whether *מַמְזֵר* is to be derived from *זָר*. Wepler (in his Philosophical and Critical Fragments) compares it with the Arabic *مُزْمِر*, *corrupter*; of which he takes it to be the participle of *Hipbil*. In this supposition *מַמְזֵר* will be the Heb. root. But, supposing it to be a derivative from *זָר*, still it may denote *a spurious brood*; one sprung from a *strange unknown father*: and this I am strongly inclined to think is the real meaning of *מַמְזֵר*.

"by incest; such as by a sister, a daughter, or a married woman: and though the law must be determined according to their decision, by which we must abide, nevertheless we have the liberty of understanding Scripture as our judgment may direct us, provided we act according to their decision." This is genuine orthodoxy.

Ver. 4. *From Phethor*—פֶּתֶר—or, as Sam.* מִפֶּתֶר; for which there is nothing in Sep. and Vulg. But all the other ant. interpreters have it, and read as the present Heb. It is probably the same with *Balis*, a small town on the west side of the Euphrates. See Busching, tom. xiii. p. 304. of the 2d German edition.

Ver. 13. It is strange how the Roman editors of the Vulgate could divide and point this verse and the following as they have done, making *Quo relevatus es* a part of ver. 14.; whereas in all the prior editions, that I have seen, the 14th verse begins with *Dominus*.

Ver. 17. What I have rendered "a catamite," שִׁקְרָא, I now suspect to be some such person as the *bherooab* among the Hindoos; that is, a sort of pimp, or attendant musician upon prostitutes. See the Hindoo Code, p. 171.

Ver. 18. *The price of a dog*—כֶּלֶב דָּוָר—Sep. ἀλλογία κυνός—Vulg. *pretium canis*—and so equivalently all the versions down to Gr. Ven. which has, not improperly, τιμήματα κυνός. The question among commentators is, whether the word *dog* is here to be taken in a literal or in a figurative sense. Le Clerc maintains the latter, against Bochart and Spencer: but their opinion has been defended by Ikenius, and appears to be just. Legislators are not wont to use metaphoric expressions in the wording of their precepts. The classing of the hire of a prostitute, and the price or hire of a dog, together, was natural enough: and the hire or price of either must be supposed an odious offering at the altar of God. Rosenmüller, however, defends Le Clerc's explanation: "Sed priorem illam interpretationem, quidquid etiam viri isti doctissimi dicant, postulat orationis filium: nec intelligo quomodo cuipiam in mentem venire possit, pretium ex cane vendito templo consecrare. Pretium canis est pretium ex cynedo solutum. Canis autem vocatur talis homo impurus, quod canes in via coeuntes imitatur: unde et κυναιδος apud Græcos. Constat autem, Phœnices mercedem usuræ corporis sui Deo vovisse." Houbigant had before defended the same opinion. Michaëlis and Hezel think that כֶּלֶב here means a Sodomite †: but Dathe, *pretium ex vendito cane*. I have retained the word *dog* in my version: but the reader may understand it of a four-legged dog, or of a two-legged dog, as he deems the most probable ‡.

CHAP. XXIV.

Ver. 1. *ON account of some defect which he finds in her.* The Hebrew words which I render "some defect," עֲוֹת דָּבָר, are by Montanus rendered *nuditatem verbi*—by our English translators, *something unclean*—Sep. ἀσχηματισμα §—Vulg. *aliquam faditatem*—and so equivalently Onk. Syr. and both Arabs. But Tharg. || עֲוִיטָת שְׁתָּוָה, *some transgression*: and this *trans-*

* The printed Sam. wants the prefix: but one ms. has, I think, preserved the true reading. † The former renders כֶּלֶב דָּוָר "lohn für knabenschande"—the latter, "geld für knabenschande." Luther had rendered "hundegeld."

‡ On the laws respecting *usury* in this chapter, see Michaëlis's *Mosaical Jurisprudence*, so often already referred to, part iii. sect. 152.

§ Very similarly Gr. Ven. ἀσχηματισμὸς πρᾶγματος.

|| Misprinted

ἁρὴν in Pol.

gressum, by Rabbi Sammai and his followers, is supposed to be *adultery*. But R. Hillel and his party extend the עריות דבר to whatever may displease the husband. The opinion of the Sammaïtes is untenable; for adultery was punished with death: but the opinion of the Hillelites appears to be too lax. It is probable that either some very great bodily blemish, or some base immoral habit, was meant by the legislator. Delgado has well remarked, that "the first three verses in this chapter contain a chain of successive events, finishing with the case in ver. 3.; and ver. 4. expresses what will be the law in such a case." Our critics would say, that the first three verses are a *protasis*, the fourth an *apodosis*.

Ver. 3. *A bill of divorce*—ספר כריתות—Sep. βιβλιον αποστασίου—Vulg. *libellum repudi*—more literally Gr. Ven. βιβλιον τομης, for such is the import of the Heb. word כריתות—*libellum abscissionis*; not *excidii*, as Montanus renders it. At Aleppo (says Dr. Ruffel) a man may on very slight pretences get rid of his wife by law: but when a woman is thus divorced, she reclaims her dowry, except in some particular cases. If the man should repent of what he has done before the expiration of three months, the power of asking the woman back rests with him: but if he permit that time to elapse without declaring his intention, the woman may then refuse her consent, and is free to marry whom she pleases. The power of the man, however, is limited to *two* divorces; for, if he divorce her a third time, he cannot take her back until she have consummated a marriage with some other man; by whom, after the term prescribed by the Koran, she may legally be divorced. *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 278.

Ver. 15. *Day by day*—Heb. ביום—*in die ejus*—or, as Gr. Ven. εν τη ημερα αυτου—Sep. αυθημερον—Vulg. *eodem die*. It evidently means, that the hire is to be paid every day, as long as the service continues.

Ver. 17. *And to the orphan*. The present Heb. has no copulative before *orphan*, but reads thus: לא תטה משפט נר יתום: "Thou shalt not decline doing justice to the stranger orphan:" and what is more singular, this is also the reading of Sam.—But most* of the ant. interpreters must have read יתום; and this is still the reading of 12 of Kennicott's mss. De Rossi found this same reading in 7 mss. of Onkelos, and in the printed edition of Sora 1490.—The other addition in this verse, "and to the widow," I have inserted, in my version, on the authority of Sep. and 2 Heb. mss. This was, at first, the reading of one of De Rossi's copies of Onkelos: and by comparing the precept with Exod. 22. 21. Jerem. 22. 3.† and Zach. 7. 10. one must be convinced, I think, that this is no interpolation.

CHAP. XXV.

Ver. 2. *SHALL cause him to be laid down*—רפץ, from נפל. The Septuagint took it here to be in the imperative mood, as it is in Josh. 13. 16. and render καθεις αυτον εναντι των κριτων. But this rendering is incompatible with the present Heb. text; (which agrees with Sam.) in which

* It is a mistake in Houbigant to say, that all the versions in the Polyglott have the copulative, save Onkelos. It is wanting in Perf. It was also wanting in the copies of Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. which latter has, very literally, Ου κλινεις κρισιν παροικου ορφανου. But that the other reading is the genuine one, is clear: and our translators had no reason to put *nor* in Italics.

† Misprinted, in my Explanatory Note, 23.

the word **השפוט** is evidently the nominative to **הפיל** : and so it was understood by all the other antient interpreters. The Rabbins tell us that the scourge used had three cords, so that every stroke was counted three stripes : by which means they could not give more than 39 without passing the number of 40. Jarhi says that a part of those stripes were given on the back, and a part on the breast and belly : but this is not very credible.

Ver. 3. *Should faint before your eyes*—**נקלה לעיניך**—Sep. **απαχρηματισει εναντιον σου**—Vulg. paraphrases the whole comma thus : *ne facdè laceratus ante oculos tuos abeat frater tuus*—Onk. and Syr. retain the Heb. word—Tharg. **רמבז**, *be contemptible*—and so equivalently both Arabs, Perf. and Gr. Ven. which last has **απαχρηματισει**.—Michaëlis rejects all these interpretations, and takes **קלה** in its common signification of *urere*, corresponding with the Latin metaphor *urere loris* : and Dathe thinks this a very ingenious and probable explanation. Ingenious it certainly is : but I cannot think it so probable. I see no reason to depart from the common derivation, although I think that the antients have much mistaken the meaning of **נקלה**. It can hardly mean here, to be dishonoured, or made contemptible : for, as Michaëlis most justly observes, how could more than forty lashes make a criminal more contemptible than forty ? The end of the precept is evidently to prevent an excessive punishment, which might prove fatal to the life of the person. Without having recourse, then, to Michaëlis's metaphor, I find in **קל** the true meaning of **נקלה**, which is here not *to be vilified*, or *seem vile* ; but *to be faint, languid, exhausted*. Compare the Chaldee **קלקל**, and the Syr. and Arab. **קל**, and you will have little doubt, I think, that this is the true meaning of **נקלה** in this passage.

Ver. 4. *Ye shall not muzzle an ox when he is treading out the grain*. This was to oppose the usage of Egypt, where the ox was muzzled during his labour in the treading-floor. But the Mohammedans of Aleppo, and the Moors of Africa, observe the Mosaic " custom of allowing " the oxen who separate the corn from the straw to eat what they please." See Ruffel's *Aleppo*, vol. i. p. 50 : Hoeft's *Nachrichten von Pers und Morocco*, p. 129 ; and Michaëlis's *Mosaic Jurisprudence*, tom. iii. sect. 130—as on the law contained in ver. 6—10. the reader will do well to consult the same work, tom. ii. sect. 98.

Ver. 9. *Spit before him*—**יקרה בפניו**—by our translators rendered, *spit in his face* ; on which Delgado : " I think the English translator wrong, in rendering this passage ridiculous, by translating it, without any need, that *she should spit in his face*." Yet in this meaning the phrase seems to have been understood by most of the antient interpreters. The version of Sep. is indeed ambiguous ; or, rather, their true reading is uncertain. The Roman ed. and Canonici's ms. have **ἐμπνέεται* κατὰ προσωπον αὐτου** : which may signify *before his face* : but all the other editions, with Glasg. have **ἐν τῷ προσωπον** : and so seems to have read the Copt. translator. The old Ital. is lost. Here, again, we eagerly wait for Holmes's collation. Vulg. is clear, *spueque in faciem illius*—and so equivalently Onk. Syr. Perf. and Gr. Ven.† : but both Arabs have more properly **בפניו**, *in his presence* : and the Thargum says, *she was to spit a good deal before him*, **קרחי**, that she might be seen by the elders. That this is the true meaning, I have no doubt.

* Oxon. and Canon. have **ἐμπνέεται**.

† **ἐμπνέει τῷ προσωπον αὐτου**.

CHAP. XXVI.

Ver. 3. *THY God*—אלהינו—and so all the versions save Sep. which in the Rom. ed. and in Alex.* and Glasg. has *τω Θεω μου*: and this reading is defended by Houbigant in the following manner: “Mendum *אלהינו* non gestabant in suis codicibus Græci interpretes, nullo qui vertunt *τω Θεω μου*, legantque *אלהינו*, quod omnino est legendum. Id mendum vetus esse liquet ex versionibus Chald. et Syr. Sed ipsâ ex vetustate mendi fons aperitur. Nam cum olim non essent litteræ finales, facillimum fuit, ut pro *אלהינו*, quod scriptum legeretur, iteraretur per imprudentiam littera כ hoc modo *אלהינו*; cum præsertim his in versibus sæpe recurreret verbum *אלהינו*, Moïse populum alloquente. Ob eam vero ipsam causam quod Moïses, ad populum sermonem habens, dicat *אלהינו*, *Deus tuus*, convenit ut populus dicat *אלהינו*, *Deo meo*; minimè verò ut idem populus sacerdoti dicat *Deo tuo*, eo præsertim loco, ubi agitur non sacerdos, sed ipse populus *Deo suo* gratias ob fruges, eo providente, natas et adultas, ex quibus primitias offerre possit.” There are, I doubt not, who will be of Houbigant’s opinion: but his rule of congruency is a precarious criterion; and as all the copies of both texts, and all the other ant. versions down to Gr. Ven. inclusively, have the other reading, I have adopted it in my translation.

Ver. 5. *My forefather was a wandering Aramite*—אֲרָם אֲבִיר אֲבִי—by our translators rendered, “A Syrian ready to perish was my father.” It is a difficult passage, which was differently understood by the antient interpreters; who seem to have guessed the best they could at something like a consistent meaning. Sep. *Συριαὺν ἀπεβόλεν ὁ πατήρ μου*. If this be the true Septuagint lesson, it is plain they combined the Hebrew letters in a different manner; that is, they considered אֲבִיר as a nominative governing the verb, not in concordance with it, and must have either not read the י at all, or disjoined it from אֲרָם, and added it to אֲבִיר. It was this, perhaps, that led Houbigant to his conjectural emendation of the text, and his novel explanation of it. He writes the words thus: אֲרָם אֲבִיר אֲבִי, and renders *fumes urgebat patrem meum*; “ex potestate ea cujus supersunt Arabica in lingua non una vestigia. Nam אֲרָם Arabicè habet *absumere*. Item אֲרָם, *terra desolata*.” Few critics, I believe, will accede to this explanation.—Let us return to the antients. Vulg. *Syrus persequabatur patrem meum*—and so equivalently Onk. Tharg. Saad. Perf. All these † make אֲרָם the nominative, and אֲבִיר the objective, and אֲבִיר the third person præf. of the active voice, called *pibet*. But the Masorites have pointed the word as a participle, and, I think, justly. Three of Kennicott’s mss. have אֲבִיר; which I take to be the genuine reading, and was rather astonished not to find in the Sam. copies. But if אֲבִיר or אֲבִיר be the true reading, what is its true meaning? I think its true

* It was wrong in Grabe to thrust *μου* into the margin, and place *σου* in his text; as the other is a very probable reading, and was followed by the Coptic translator. † So Ald. Rom. and so read the Copt. translator: but the reading of Comp. is *απεβόλεν*, and that of Alex. *απελάθεν*. Perhaps none of the three readings is the original one: at least, if they read in their Heb. copy the words we now read. At any rate, their version, as it stands at present, is unintelligible.

‡ Not so Gr. Ven. which has *Αραμὸς ἀπαλλύρο ὁ πατήρ μου*. Singular is the reading of Syr. *לֵאמֹר אֲרָם אֲבִיר*, *ad Aram deductus est pater me*, as it is rendered in Pol. but which, perhaps, would be better rendered *conversatus est apud Aramum*, i. e. *Libanum*: if indeed the copies be not corrupted, as I greatly suspect. Yet I find no variation among Thorndike’s ms. readings.

meaning is what I have given in my version; *wandering*, like a pilgrim, from place to place; according to his own account of himself to Pharaoh: "The days of the years of my sojournment (or peregrination) are an hundred and thirty years." See the note on that place.—Michaëlis's version adopted by Hezel is: "Mein vater war ein herumirrender Mesopotamier"—that of Dathe: *Pater meus fuit Syrus oberrans*. I add Rosenmüller's scholium: "*Aramæus vagus* (cum gregibus deserti pererrans, Nomas.) erat pater meus. Syrus gente, patria extorris, inter Chanaanitas pascuas, nullis certis sedibus, pererrans; אֲבִיר non est vertendum *perditus* vel *periturus*; nam Abrahamus, Isaacus et Jacobus divites erant ac potentes: sed *errans* ut Ps. 119. 176."

Ver. 17, 18. There is a term which occurs in each of these verses, that has been variously rendered: דָּמַר in ver. 17. and דָּמַר in ver. 18. It is agreed that they are both in the coactive voice of דָּמַר; but their precise meaning is disputed. In both places Sep. has the same verb, εἶλεν and εἶλετο—and Vulg. *elegisti* and *elegit*—Onk. דָּמַר and דָּמַר, in Pol. rendered *elegisti* and *elegit*; but, perhaps, better *exaltasti* and *exaltavit*: which seems to be the meaning in which the words were understood by Saad. and Perf. certainly by Arab. Erp. and Gr. Ven. the former of which has שָׁרַף and שָׁרַף; the latter, ἐκράς and ἐκράς. This comes nearly to the interpretation of some modern critics; who, finding in the Arabic a signification of דָּמַר that indicates *empire, domination, &c.* imagine that דָּמַר may here be rendered *principatum concedere*. So Dathe: *Vos quidem Jova hodie principatum concedistis*—"Quæ interpretatio (says Rosenmüller) sane sensum aptissimum efficere videtur." Not to me, I confess; who am inclined to think, with Houbigant, that the mood *hiphil*, or coactive voice, here only strengthens the signification of the active voice *kal*: and, consequently, that דָּמַר signifies *to declare solemnly*; or, as our common version has it, *to avouch*. Michaëlis and Hezel think it means *to make an agreement*; from the Arab. signification of דָּמַר, *consentire, mutuo promittere*: and this comes nearly to the same purpose as mutually *to declare*; which last word I have preferred in my version. For the rest, the words "and his decrees," דָּמַר, are wanting in all the Sam. copies, and in one of Kennicott's Heb. mss.*

CHAP. XXVII.

Ver. 2. *AND join them with lime*—וְשָׂדֶה אֲבָן בִּשְׂדֵה—Sep. κοινοῖς αὐτοὺς κοῆμ—Vulg. *calce levigabis eos*—and so nearly equivalently the other versions. But the Greek of Venice has a word which, perhaps, the best of all expresses the meaning of the original, τιτανοῖς τ' αὐτοὺς εν τιτανοῖς: by which, I conceive, is not meant that the stones were to be plastered over with plaster, as our public translation has it; but that they were to be cemented together with mortar. The idea of some modern interpreters, that the stones were first to be inscribed on, and then to be coated over with plaster, the better to preserve the inscription, appears to me to be a mere fancy. The end of the inscription was undoubtedly, that it might be at all times

* The copies of Sep. vary. Rom. Ambros. Canon. have only τα δικαιώματα και τα κριματα—Alex. and Glasg. add αὐτοῖς after κριματα, but want και τας εντολας αὐτου, with Rom. and 1 Heb. ms.—Ald. and Comp. have και τας εντολας, without αὐτου either after εντολας or after the preceding δικαιώματα—But the Oxford ms. is as full as the present Heb. τα δικαιώματα αὐτου, και τας εντολας αὐτου, και τα κριματα αὐτου.

legible to every Israelite. To cover it over with plaster would be to lock it from the sight of the people, and to render it an useless dumb monitor. Others suppose that the writing was upon the plaster itself; and this I should deem more probable, if a writing of that kind were durable, when exposed to the winds and weather; which, when done in *fresco*, I am told it is. But it is a question, if the Israelites understood painting in *fresco*: and stones would naturally occur to their legislator, as the most proper material for preserving his injunctions. Whether those, here mentioned, comprehended the whole law or Deuteronomy, or only the ten commandments, or the blessings and curses recorded in this chapter, is a subject of controversy among our commentators, which I shall not enter into. My own opinion I have given in my Explanatory Note. The objection, that the Deuteronomy would have taken such a number of stone tables, as could hardly be erected in one place, is in my apprehension a weak one. The stones are said to be "large stones," each of which might contain a whole chapter, for aught we know. Now, four-and-thirty such stones would not make a very long wall, were each of them supposed to be three feet wide: but if they were arranged in a solid square, they would present a face of less than thirty feet; and surely on four such faces the whole Deuteronomy might be inscribed in capitals, large enough to be read at a considerable distance; especially if they were deep cut in the stone.

Ver. 4. There is in this verse a various or rather a contradictory reading in Sam. text and version, *Garizim* instead of *Ebal*: and this, in our days, has given rise to a vehement controversy. Dr. Kennicott has laboured to prove that the Samaritan lection is genuine, and that the Jews have corrupted their copies out of odium to that nation, and to their temple which was constructed on mount *Garizim*. Several answers have been made to his arguments, which in my opinion are more specious than solid; not excepted even those of Verschuur, although his countrymen deem them proofs. The controversy between the Jews and Samaritans, about their respective temples, is nothing to the purpose. The question then was not, whether *Garizim* or *Ebal* was the place of blessing; but whether the temple at Jerusalem or the temple at Samaria was the most holy place. If the Jewish temple had been built on mount *Ebal*, the Samaritans might have had some temptation to alter their copies: but as both mountains were unoccupied when they reared their temple, they had the choice of erecting it on either of the mountains: and is it in the smallest degree probable, that, if they had found in their copy of the Deuteronomy the blessings addressed to mount *Ebal*, they would not have chosen that mountain for the site of their temple?—Whereas, when their temple had been built on mount *Garizim*, because there Moses had ordered the covenant-stones, and an altar to be erected, it was quite natural for their enemies the Jews, in order to discredit their temple, to alter the names in the book of Deuteronomy, and for *Garizim* insert *Ebal*.

Such is the light in which the controversy appears to me: but as it is of very small importance in itself, and to us Christians of none at all, I have left *Ebal* in the text.

Ver. 5. Rosenmüller thinks that the altar, mentioned in this verse, is the same with the stones on which the law was to be written: "Non est novum hoc mandatum a superiore diversum; sed Moses docet lapides quos antea dixit statuendos et *testorio oblinendos*, debere in formam altaris se componi." Quis credat hoc? To command the law to be written on a set of rough unhewn stones, would be a very uncommon commandment: and as to their being

covered over with plaster, this is begging the question *. I would rather say that ver. 8. is an *apodosis*, belonging to ver. 4. after which I have placed it in my version.

Ver. 16. *Despisetis*—רָחַץ—Sep. and Gr. Ven. ὁ αὐμαζών—Vulg. *qui non honorat* : i. e. “who dishonours,” according to the Scripture idiom. The Syr. translator has a word that denotes rather *to curse*. The other versions either retain the Heb. word, or have terms equivalent. But the meaning of the Heb. word itself is disputed. The antients seem to have confounded it with רָחַץ. Dathe sticks to the primary signification of רָחַץ, *urere* ; which, metaphorically, he thinks, is *to defame*. Michaëlis has “schläget,” *strike*. I have followed the antients.

Ver. 26. *All the precepts of this law*. “The word *all* (says Dr. Kennicott), which our translators have inserted as wanting before *the words of this law*, was thought by Jerom absolutely necessary to justify St. Paul’s quotation Galat. 3. 10. ; and it is very remarkable that this important word is now found here, not only in the Sam. text and its version, but also in 4 Hebrew mss. The Latin version of the Chald. paraphrase has *omnibus* here, in Walton’s Polyglott ; though the word is not in the adjoining column of the Chaldee. And though it is not in the Syr. Arab. or Vulg. versions, as there printed, I have no doubt, but it may be found in some very ant. mss. of these versions. It has been found in 6 Chald. mss.” Remarks, p. 81.—I have some observations to make on this remark. In the first place, I have little doubt of *all*, כָּל, having stood originally in the text : as, beside the authorities here quoted by Kennicott, the Septuagint have ἐν παντί τοῖς λόγοις, in all the copies that I have seen : and so the Coptic version, and the ant. Italic. But, 2dly, although I consider it as the true reading, I do not think it of any importance ; nor do I believe with Jerom that the Jews threw it out of their text for the reason alleged by him†. I believe it dropped out accidentally from the carelessness of transcribers ; and that too at a very early period ; as it was not read by Aquila, Sym. Theod. nor by Jerom himself in the Heb. copies of his day. It is found, indeed, in one or two copies of Onkelos‡ ; but in none of the other versions.—For the rest, there is no absolute need of it : *The precepts* say just as much as *all the precepts*. When our Saviour says, “If thou wouldst enter into life, observe the commandments ;” he means as much as if he had said, “observe all the commandments :” for, where none are excepted, all are necessarily included.

The word אָמֵן, *amen*, which occurs so often in this chapter, is variously rendered. Sep. *yevoire*, *be it so*—Vulg. and all the other versions retain the Heb. word ; except Gr. Ven. which has *ut*, *I so wish*.—The word is used in most Liturgies ; and was retained by our translators in their version of the Bible ; as well as by the greater number of foreign translators§.—I have also judged it proper to retain it in my version.

* Besides that, if these stones had been used as an altar, the violence of the fire, and the constant friction and other injuries, which must have arisen from the near approach of those who placed wood and victims, and entertained the flame, would soon have cracked the plaster, and even the stones themselves ; and in time have effaced or defaced the inscriptions.

† “Frustra igitur tulerunt Judæi, ne viderentur sub maledicto, si non possent omnia complere, quæ scripta sunt.” This remark is unworthy of Jerom.

‡ Kennicott says it has been found in six : but I find only two in De Rossi ; and one of these has been corrected.

§ Luther, Castalio, Junius, the Tigurines, the Dutch, Diodati, the Spanish of Ferrara, and of De Valera, &c. The French translations vary. The first Genevan has “ainsi soit-il,” *so be it* ; but the New Revision has “amen”—So Le Gros—but Le Cene has “nous le souhaitons”—Dathe, *ita*—Michaëlis, *amen*.

C H A P. XXVIII.

IT is well remarked by Rosenmüller, that we are not to look for the literal completion of the threats and promises contained in this long chapter, in the eventual history of the Israelites. The general purport is, that they shall be happy in obeying, unhappy in transgressing, the precepts and ordinances laid down for them. "*Felicitatem autem, et mala Moses ex more orientali variis depingit coloribus, et omnem hanc descriptionem adornat pulchris et sublimibus imaginibus.*" Indeed, the whole is highly poetical.

Ver. 5. *Your baskets*—כַּסְאֵי—Sep. *ἀσποθήκαι*—and Vulg. *borrea*. But the other versions have words that denote *baskets*; and this is undoubtedly the true meaning. It is well rendered by Gr. Ven. *ταλαροί*.

Ib. *Kneading-troughs*—כַּסְאֵי—by our translators wrongly rendered *store*; although they elsewhere render the same word *kneading-troughs*: and here their marginal reading is *dough* or *kneading-trough*. Purver. has *kneading-vessel*. Bate follows Sep. and Vulg. *τὰ ἐγνατολάγματα σου*—*reliquiae tue*—but all the other versions have words that denote some dough-vessel, or *dough* itself—Gr. Ven. *ἡ ζύμη σου*. See my Explai. Note.

Ver. 8. Our translators here had more reason to render כִּסְמֵי *storehouses*: and I am not sure, that it is not a better term than the one I have substituted, *granaries*; if the word *granary* be limited to a storehouse for *grain* only.—Sep. *ταμεα*—Vulg. *cellaria*—Onk. Tharg. and Syr. *אוצר*, *treasuries*—But both Arabs and Gr. Ven. have words that denote *barns*, or *granaries*.

Ver. 15. *And to practise all*—לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת כָּל—*for so I read (with the copulative) with 5 MSS. and the primitive reading of three more; and with most of the ancient versions. The comma, indeed, is wanting in Sam. and I have said in Var. Read. that it was probably not read by Sep. It is indeed in all the printed editions, save Rom. but it was not read by the Coptic translator: although it appears to have been in the old Italic version. See Sabatier.—For the rest, those who prefer the present reading לעשות, without the copulative, give to the preceding שמר the meaning of זכר. So Rosenmüller, ut meminervis facere: and so equivalently Gr. Ven. φυλάττειν ὡς τιμῶμεν—and our common version, to observe to do: but the parallel place ver. 13. seems to justify the other reading.*

Ver. 20. *Until ye be destroyed and perish*—עד השמדך ועד אבדך. So the present text. But the Sam. copy has עד השמדך ועד האבדך, followed by almost all the ant. translators; as is remarked in Var. Read.—It is of little importance, as the meaning is all the same.

Ver. 22. *Consumptions and fevers.* See Cr. Rem. on Levit. 26. 16.

Ib. *Agues*—דלקת. Although it be not easy to ascertain what particular disease is meant by this word, I am very much inclined to think it is *the ague*. The Septuagint have *πρηι*, and Vulg. *frigore*. Most of the other translators, indeed, have words that denote rather the contrary; and the nine other places in which the word occurs seem favourable to that meaning. But this is by no means against its being the *ague*; which may be distinguished by its *hot* as well as *cold* fit. What induces me to believe it to be the *ague*, beside the authority of Sep. and Saadias, (who expressly calls it חומי מלרבע, *a quartan fever*.) is, that an Ethiopic word

of the same origin denotes *to tremble*; and another derived from it *an earthquake*. See Ludolph's Lexicon, or Castell.—In Arab. also *قَلَق* denotes *restlessness, commotion, &c.*

Ib. *Inflammations*—חֲרָר—Sep. *ḥarar*—Vulg. *ardore*—and so equivalently Syr. Perf. and Gr. Ven. which has *καύρων*. Rosenmüller has no doubt of its being a *catarrhus suffocation*; “nomen habens a *ronchissando*.” The word חֲרָר, *harbar*, or *barkur*, has certainly a sound not badly expressing such a suffocation: but sounds are uncertain criteria of genuine *etyma*: and in no other place find we this idea in the root חֲרָר. I cannot better finish this remark than in the words of Dathe: “Qui morbi in lingua Latina, aut Germanica (adde Anglica) his nominibus morborum Hebraicis respondeant, nemo tutò dixerit. Conjecturæ ex verborum origine petitiæ incertæ sunt.”

The three remaining maladies are not more certain. The first, חֲרָב, which I render *droughts*, is by others rendered *the sword*: and so it seems to have been understood by Sep. who have *חרב**. So certainly Gr. Ven. *ἐξέρπει*; and so equivalently the Thargums, Syr. and Perf. But Vulg. has *æstu*, and both Arabs and the Sam. version have equivalent terms†. I prefer this meaning, because the word is here classed with other calamities which affect the fruits of the earth, namely,

Blights and mildews—שֶׁדֶף and יֶרֶק; the former of which terms is by Sep. rendered *ανεμοφθορια*‡—by Vulg. *aere corrupto*, a literal version of Sep.—Onk. Syr. and Perf. have also similar terms.—Perhaps it is to be understood of the wind called the *famiel* or *finem*. I could find no English term so proper as *blight*.

The other term, יֶרֶק, by Sep. *תֵּי אַחַז*, and by Gr. Ven. *αχχοτη*, is most probably what we call *mildew*. Jerom has *rubigine*—Onk. יֶרֶקָא, which is only the Heb. word Chaldaized.

Ver. 24. *Until ye be destroyed*—עַד חֲשֹׁמֶךָ. So the present text: but Sam. has *עד חֲשֹׁמֶךָ*, followed by Sep. and Syr.—There is in this verse an addition in Sep. *וְעַד שֶׁיִּשְׁלַח אֱלֹהִים אֶת הָאֵשׁ בְּיָדְךָ*: but the last two words are wanting in Ald. Comp. Alex. Ox. and Glasg. Nor are they in the old Ital. quoted by Jerom. Yet they were read by the Coptic translator.

Ver. 27. *The ulcers of Egypt*. That species of leprosy called the *elephantiasis* was, if we believe Lucretius and Pliny, peculiar to Egypt:

“Est elephas morbus, qui propter flumina Nili

“Gignitur Ægypto in mediâ, neque præterea usquam.” *Lucret.* vi. 1112.

Ib. *The piles*—עֲפָלִים. The Septuagint considered עֲפָלִים not as a different malady from the foregoing, but its seat. They seem to have read *בְּעֲפָלִים*, without the copulative; as they read the comma thus: Παταξαι σε Κυριος ἐλκει Αργυπτιω εις την εδραν—but all the other ant. translators read *בְּעֲפָלִים* in their copies; although they understood the word differently.—Sym. *κακηται*—Vulg. *parte corporis, per quam stercore egeruntur*—Onk. בְּחִתְרוֹן—Tharg. בְּחִתְרוֹן—Syr. בְּחִתְרוֹן—Saad. אֵלְבֹסֶר—all words that denote some malady affecting the *anus*—Gr. Ven. more explicitly *ἀνισορροια*.—I believe it to be *the piles*.

* The word is wanting in the Roman edition.

† It may signify either a *sword* or *aridity*.

‡ It is remarkable that Gr. Ven. has the very same word.

§ Some copies have *ἐν ταῖς ἔδραις*. If any copy have *καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἔδραις*, it has been probably accommodated to the Hebrew.

Ib. *Wish scabs and with itches*—בִּטְרֵב וּבִדְרֵס—Sep. *ῥοπα ἀγρυπ καὶ κίττα*—Vulg. *scabie et prurigine*—and so equivalently, or nearly equivalently, all the versions—Gr. Ven. *σ τ ρ ῥοπα καὶ οὐκίττα*.

Ver. 35. This verse contains a genuine description of the *elephantiasis*. See Schilling *De Lepra*, p. 184. or Rosenmüller's *scholium* on the place.

Ver. 38. *For the locusts shall devour it*. The Heb. word which I render *devour* is דָּבַר, which, as a verb, occurs only here; but its meaning is pretty clear from the context, and is moreover ascertained by the sister dialects. See the Chald. and Sam. דָּבַר.

Ver. 42. *The blight*. The Heb. word is דִּלְצָל, commonly rendered *the locust*: and some have ventured to define it to be *gryllus stridulus* Linnæi; and that its very name *islatfal* imports as much. Most of the antient versions favour some such meaning: yet I am inclined to think that דִּלְצָל is not an animal, but a particular sort of blight that principally affects trees. I have therefore followed Sep. and Vulg. the former of which have ἡ ἐπιστάη*; the latter *rubigo*.

Ver. 57. *Secundines*—סְלִית—Sep. *το χορίον †*—Gr. Ven. *ὕδατος*—Vulg. *illuvia secundarum*: and so equivalently the other versions: yet I am not sure, but that סְלִית is the *embryo* itself, and not its envelope.

Ver. 68. *Ye shall there be sold as slaves, &c.* Blackwall renders thus: “Ye shall be set to sale; and no one shall buy you.”—Law: “Ye shall offer yourselves to be sold,” &c.—and the Heb. will bear such a rendering.—Those who consider this menace as a prophecy refer it to the time of Titus and of Hadrian. The former sent 17,000 adult Jews into Egypt, to be there employed in hard labour; and ordered those under seventeen years to be sold to the best bidder. In the reign of Hadrian a very great number of Jews were sold in the same manner at Rachel's sepulchre. See Joseph. *De Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. and Jerom on the 31st chapter of Jeremiah.

CHAP. XXIX.

IN our common version, and indeed in all the versions in the Polyglott, the first verse of this chapter is wrongly disjoined from the preceding chapter; to which it evidently belongs; and should be noted ver. 69. as it is in the first editions of the Hebrew text, followed by Kennicott.—I have restored the verse to its proper place; but mark it, in the margin, as belonging to chap. 29. for the sake of reference.

Ver. 5. *I have conducted you*—אָלַךְ אִתְּכֶם—*ambulare feci vos*. So the present text, and so the Sam. † But the Septuagint read in the third person, *ἡγάγεω*; and so Jerom, *adduxit*; and Syr. דָּבַר. And, I confess, this reading seems to suit the context better than the other.

Ver. 6. *Bread ye have not eaten, &c.* This must not be too strictly and literally understood.

* Suidas, indeed, says that the word means also a little animal which is born in the fruit and destroys it: *στροβίον τὸ ἐν τῷ σιτῷ γινόμενον*—but he adds that some consider it only as a malady that harbours in the seeds, and corrupts the fruit: *τινὲς νοσὸν ἐπιγινόμενον τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὃ λυμαινεται τὸν καρπὸν.* † Το χορίον μὲν συνεστῆκεν ἐκ δύο φλεβῶν καὶ δύο ἀρτηριῶν, καὶ περικύβητον τοῦ καλουμένου εὐραχίου, ἡτοὶ ἐπειδὴ χωρῆμα ἐστὶ τοῦ ἐμβρύου, οἰοῦν χορίον, ἡ ἐπειδὴ χωρῆται τὴν τροφήν αὐτῶ. Hippocr. *Deñ. Med.* It is also written *χωρίον*. ‡ Wrongly marked in my Var. Read. for Sep.

They were not altogether destitute of bread, or of wine; both which were used in their sacrifices: but that bread and that wine must have been purchased from strangers, as they had no corn-fields or vineyards of their own, during their nomadical life in the wilderness.

Ver. 18. *Venom and wormwood*—וַשְׁמָוֶה וְרַמְמָוֶה. Instead of וַשְׁמָוֶה five mss. have וַשְׁוֶה, and a sixth had at first the same reading; which, in the elder editions, was the textual reading in ch. 32. 32. and which I am apt to think is the true original reading.—But what is the precise meaning of וַשְׁוֶה or וַשְׁמָוֶה, it is not easy to determine.—The antients render variously. Sep. χαλη—Vulg. *fel.*—So equivalently Syr.—Onk. and the Thargums use general metaphorical terms.—Both Arabs. and Perf. have also general terms, but denoting *venom*—Gr. Ven. τειθυμαλλον; a species of sea-lettuce; which, according to Columella, is, with salt, good for recent wounds. Celsius takes it to be *hemlock*. I am inclined to think it is *rue*: but as this is mere conjecture; and as in other places it seems to denote *poison*, I have in my version adopted that general term.

With regard to the next word, רַמְמָוֶה, it is rendered by Sep. *ωικρη*, and by Vulg. *amaritudine*: but most of the other interpreters have *wormwood*. The words “this day,” in the first colon of this verse, are wanting in all the copies of Sep. that I have yet seen: perhaps *σημερον* may be found in some of Holmes’s mss.

Ver. 19. *So as to gratify every appetite*—לִמְעַן שִׂפּוֹת הָרָצָה אֶת דְּמִצְתָּהּ. How variously these words have been explained, the reader may see in Pole. I shall here give only the principal ancient versions, with one or two of modern critics: Sep. *ὅνα μὴ συνάπολεσθῃ δ' αἵμαρτυρίας τῶν ἀνομιῶν*: a strange version indeed, if they read as we now do.—Vulg. *et absumat ebria sitientem*: equally unintelligible.—Onk. בְּדִל לְאִשְׁמָא לִיה חֲסִידָא עַל דְּנִרְתָּא—“so that to his sins of ignorance be added sins of pride:” an evident paraphrase, but founded, I think, on the literal meaning. The Thargums give a similar explanation.—Syr. *וְנִתְּנָה רִירוּתָא עַל צִדְקָתָא*: quite literally—and so equivalently the Sam. version, Perf. and Gr. Ven. which agrees with our common version, “so as to add drunkenness to thirst.”—Le Clerc, followed by Dathe, supplies the word *garb*; and renders, *ut addat irrigationem terræ sitiēti*; to which he gives a figurative meaning, which is justly rejected by Rosenmüller*.—Rosenmüller himself is pleased with Michaëlis’s interpretation: “ut absumet (*radix illa noxia* ver. preced.) terram irriguam et siti-culosam †.”—I think, with Houbigant, that the Syriac translator has well and literally rendered the words; and that their metaphorical meaning is what I have given in my version.—Delgado gives a different and ingenious, but less natural, explication ‡.

Ver. 27. The words which I have included in a parenthesis could not well be pronounced by the Israelite, in whose mouth this speech is put; unless he had then before him a volume of the law. I would therefore consider them as an incidental explanation of Moses himself; as if

* “Tunc terra *sitiens*, per metaphoram, esset animus Israelitarum, desiderium idololatriæ fovens; et cogitationes illæ, quas sub hujus versus initio legimus, suaves iis et optatæ, essent *irrigatio terre sitiētis*!” † This interpretation, however, he has not followed in his German translation; which is, “wenn er gleich nach seinen eigenen gedanken und willkür handelt.”—Both interpretations are, in my opinion, unwarrantable. ‡ His version is: “to add the well watered ground to the thirsty.” That is (says he) “to add the crimes committed through wantonness and pride to those committed when [one is] led by a strong desire, not being able to subdue the passions . . . as, when David brought Uriah’s wife to his bed, it was a crime which he could scarcely withstand: but when he caused the death of Uriah, it was a great addition to his crime.”

he had said, "meaning those maledictions, which are written in this book, or volume.—Sep. seem to have read in their copy $\text{בְּסֵפֶר הַדְּבָרִים הַזֶּה}$: $\text{ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νομοῦ τούτου}$.

Ver. 29. Is by Sep. rendered thus : $\text{τα κρυπτα Κυρίου τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν* τα δὲ φανερα ἡμῶν}$ (al. ὡμῶν) $\text{καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν}$ (al. ὡμῶν) $\text{εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. κ. τ. λ.}$ —by Vulg. *abscondita, Domino Deo nostro : quæ manifesta sunt, nobis et filiis nostris usque in sempiternum*, &c. : as unintelligible as the Doway version : "things hidden to our Lord God, which are manifest, to us and to our children for ever," &c. Nor, indeed, is any version that I have seen, either antient or modern, in my apprehension, satisfactory. I have therefore risked one of my own ; which perhaps, to others, will appear as unsatisfactory as former ones to me. The meaning, I think, is : "The chastisements which we now undergo, are a manifestation of the secret designs of the Lord against us, in case we should in any age cease to observe his laws." And this inclines me to believe that they are the conclusion of the answer to the queries in ver. 24. rather than a resumption by Moses. I add, below, the versions of Houbigant, Michaëlis, and Dathe †.

CHAP. XXX.

I HAVE nothing to add to my Explanatory Notes on this chapter ; save that in

Ver. 10. The addition from Sep. $\text{καὶ τὰς κριμαὶς αὐτοῦ}$, is wanting in Comp. but it is in all the other editions and mss. that I have seen ; and in the Coptic version.

CHAP. XXXI.

THE reader will be pleased to observe, that I have in my version transposed verses 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 23, to the end of the preceding chapter, to which they seem evidently to belong ; and where they come in much more naturally than in their present order ; as any one may convince himself, by comparing my translation with the common one.—I proceed to remark on some difficult passages.

Ver. 9 and 10. It is the remark of Rosenmüller, that *the law* here enjoined to be read every seventh year before the people, *at the festival of booths*, must be restricted to the Deuteronomy : for how, in the space of seven days, could the whole Pentateuch be read ?—I think it ought to be restricted to still narrower bounds ; that is, from the 44th verse of chap. v. to the end of chap. xxx.

Ver. 19. *This song* ; that is, the song or ode afterward recorded in chap. xxxii. Jerusalem's

* So Rom. with Comp. and Alex. But Ald. Ox. and Glasg. have ὡμῶν.—But all the other versions read as the Heb. ; and Copt. must have in his Gr. copy read ὡμῶν. † Houb. *Quæ opud Dominum [Deum] nostrum abscondita sunt, nobis et filiisque nostris palam facta sunt ad multas ætates, propterea, &c.*—Mich. "Die verborgen zukunft gehört für Jehova unser Gott : das bekannt gemachte aber ist für uns, und unser nachkommen zu ewigenzeiten," &c.—Dathe : *Occulta, Jovis Dei nostri sunt : revelata autem ad nos et posteris nostros pertinent in perpetuum,* &c.—The following remark is from Abp. Secker's MS. Notes : "The Sam. *thau* being very like the Sam. *aleph*, I take הַנִּגְלָה (the

"Sam. lection) to be a mere corruption from הַנִּגְלָה , only written fully— נִגְלָה would suit Houbigant's translation : but "the same purpose may be answered by a smaller change ; reading הַנִּגְלָה , and rejecting the prefix ; which might come "from repeating the last letter of the preceding word. Then the sense will be : 'The things which are (or were) hid "with God he hath revealed,' &c. and thus the connection will be better, but the construction not so."

fancy, that under *this song* is comprehended the whole book of Deuteronomy, appears to me a wild fancy. It was such a song as might be "taught the children of Israel, and put into "their mouths," as a constant testimony against them, if they should transgress the precepts of the Lord.

Ver. 28. *The heads and elders, &c.* The present text has only elders, זקני: but several mss. have ראשי instead of זקני, and one has both; which, I doubt not, was the original reading followed by Sep. *ταὺς φιλαρχοὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ὑμῶν.* See the note below.

Ib *In their hearing.* So both texts and all the versions. But 12 Heb. mss. have באזניכם, *in auribus vestris*; and 6 Chald. mss. have an equivalent reading. The Syr. version has לבח, *vobis*; and Saad. in Pol. has a similar reading, אכלמכם, *I will speak to them*; but the edition of Constantinople, in Heb. characters, has אכלמכם. See De Roffi.

CHAP. XXXII.

THE very beautiful ode, contained in this chapter, has exercised the critical talents of many learned moderns—Vitranga, Le Clerc, Houbigant, Lowth, Kennicott, Green, Michaëlis, Dathe; the last of whom has more happily laboured on the subject, in a particular Dissertation, first printed at Leipzig in 1768; and reprinted in his *Opuscula*, edited by Rosenmüller in 1796. Of the labours of all those, and of others, I have availed myself; but have sometimes taken the liberty to differ from them all, when I thought I had reason. These differences it must be my chief endeavour to explain, and defend, in the following Remarks; which, however, I shall make as short as possible; and without pointing out the many particular beauties of the composition; which every reader of taste must rather feel than see.

Ver. 1. *Listen, ye heavens, while I speak, &c.* So the sublime Isaiah: *Hear, ye heavens**, &c. The reader needs not be told, that this address to the Heavens and the Earth acquires a peculiar propriety from its being made in the open air.

Ver. 2. *May my doctrine drop as the rain*—יִרְדּוּ כַמָּטָר יִרְדּוּ. The word יִרְדּוּ is variously rendered—Sep. *περὶσσεύσονται*; by which they are, by some critics, supposed to express a verbal signification of עָרָה, *the neck*; as if the meaning were *to expect with outstretched necks*: and as if Moses said: Let my doctrine be expected with the same desire that a salutary shower is expected. This, I confess, is but a sorry interpretation.—Vulg. *concresecat*; for which Schulz is at a loss to conjecture what word was read in his original. But I think he read the same word as we do; and took it in a signification which it still has in Arabic; *to be thick, to thicken*, &c.—Onk. and Tharg. Jerus. have words that denote *sweet*, יִרְמָם; as if they had read in their copies יִרְמָם: and the Persian translator appears to have had the same idea.—But Syr. both Arabs, and Gr. Ven. have words denoting *to drop, distil*, or the like. The last, I think, has wonderfully well rendered the comma: *Σταξατω ὡς ὀμβρὸς το ἀλημματα μου.*

* In like manner *Æneas* in Virgil:

"Eko nunc Sol testis, et hæc mihi Terra vocanti." *Æn.* xii. 176.

And Latinus:

Suspiciens cælum, tendensque ad sidera dextram;

Hæc eadem, Ænea, Terram, mare, sidera juro. Ibid. 196.

Ver. 3. *For in the name of the Lord I address you.* I have here ventured to differ, I believe, from almost all, if not from all interpreters; who make this comma a part of ver. 3. and the beginning of the following hymn: whereas I am convinced it belongs to ver. 2. and is the natural conclusion of the prelude. Indeed, the present division has always appeared to me absurd: for, what fine illation is this: "Because I will publish the name of the Lord, *therefore* ascribe ye greatness unto our God.*" But join the *because* to what precedes, and all is clear and consecutive.—But let us analyse the text; of which we have two readings. The present Heb. is **כִּי יִזְכֹּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ**: but Sam. **כִּי בִשְׁמִי יִזְכֹּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ**—followed by Syr. and Saad. and even by the Erpenian Arab. who is generally a close imitator of the present Heb.—and this I take to be the genuine reading; although I am of opinion that the other reading admits the same meaning. But what is the meaning? I think it clear from the context, that the true meaning is what I have given in my version. Moses attests the heavens and the earth to listen to what he is going to say, and wishes that his speech be like a penetrating rain, and a reviving dew.—Why? Because he is going to speak "in the name of the Lord." So Isaiah, after a similar attestation: **כִּי יִזְכֹּר דְּבַר**—"because 'tis the Lord who speaketh."—If the antient translations be properly pointed, they will corroborate my interpretation. For example, let the Septuagint be given from an unpointed ms. thus: *Προσδοκασθαι ως υστερ το αποσβεσθαι μου και καταβητω ως δροσος τα ρηματα μου ωσει ομβρος εκ' ουρανων και ωσει νεβελος επι χερτων οτι το ονομα Κυριου εκαλεσα δοτε μεγαλειωτην τη Θεω ημων κ. τ. λ.* Who would not suppose that *οτι το ονομα Κυριου εκαλεσα* belonged to what precedes, and not to what follows; and accordingly point after *εκαλεσα*?—The editor of Saadiah has been equally unjust in the division of his author's text; which, when properly divided, well expresses the meaning of the original. Restore **לֹא אֶזְכֹּר בְּנַפְשִׁי אֱלֹהִים** to ver. 2. and point after **אֱלֹהִים**; and see if the sense be not better, and the context more consistent.—Some modern critics have endeavoured to do away the inconsistency by rendering **כִּי** not *because*; but *when*, or *while*; and giving to **אֶזְכֹּר** the meaning of *celebrabo*. So Houbigant: *Dum nomen Domini celebrabo, tribute Deo nostro gloriam.* And so our Green: "While "I am proclaiming the name of Jehovah, do ye ascribe greatness to our God."—Michaëlis, neglecting the **כִּי** entirely, makes the comma an unconnected sentence, belonging neither to ver. 2. nor ver. 1. "Jehovens namen will ich besingen."—Dathé and Rosenmüller retain the illative, but insulate the comma "*Nomen enim Jehovah celebrabo*:" but why then did not they connect this with ver. 2.?—In short, I have no doubt of the comma's belonging to what precedes; and that **כִּי** cannot here be properly translated by any other English word but *because* or *for*.—On casually casting my eye on Purver's version, since writing the above, I find that he has not badly rendered the passage: "for it is the name of the Lord that I proclaim." I wonder this did not lead him to put a full point instead of a colon after *proclaim*.

Ver. 4. *The creator.* Heb. **בְּרֹאשִׁי**, written in the common Masoretic copies with a gigantic *sfudé*: a pure Rabbinical conceit. In 100 of Kennicott's mss. the letter is no taller than its neighbours; and, no doubt, many of De Rossi's mss. had the same orthography; although he has not noticed them.—With respect to the meaning, **בְּרֹאשִׁי** commonly signifies *a rock*; and so it

* I here use our common version. Coverdale has: "For I will call upon the name of the Lord: give ye the glory unto our God."—Bate: For I will declare the name of Jehovah: ascribe ye greatness to our Alchim."

is literally rendered by Gr. Ven. ὁ λαός. The other versions metaphrase variously—Sep. Θεός*—and after them Vulg. *Dei perfecta sunt opera*—Onk. and Syr. have מְפֻרָּה, *strong*; and the latter joins the word to ver. 3. not improperly.—Saadiah follows the same arrangement, and renders מְפֻרָּה the creator; which is also the term used by Arab. Erp.—This, indeed, I take to be here the true meaning; for צוֹר, not only in Heb. but more particularly in Chald. and Syr. signifies *to form, to frame, and consequently to create*. This agrees perfectly with what follows: God is THE CREATOR, כֹּתֵץ עֲצָיו, whose works are all perfect.—Volney fancied (and an odd fancy it is) that צוֹר is the Egyptian *Ofris*!

Ver. 5. *Yet corrupted are his own degenerate children.* “It has been thought impossible (says Dr. Kennicott) to give any regular construction to the first part of this verse, as it now stands in the Heb. text: and it is therefore happy, that the Sam. Pentateuch and the Gr. and Syr. versions discover two transpositions in the present Heb. and agree to express this sense: *They are corrupted, not his; children of pollution,*” &c. This observation, borrowed from Houbigant, is partly just.—But let us see the state of the text, and its various interpretations. The present Heb. runs thus: שֶׁתָּהָם לֹא בְנֵי נֶפֶשׁ—by Montanus rendered, *corrupti sibi, non filii ejus, macula eorum*; which who can understand, may: for I do not.—Nor indeed is the original, as it here stands, to me intelligible; and which our English translators† did well to abandon. Our last vulgar version is: “They have corrupted themselves; their spot is not the spot of his children:” but in the margin: Heb. *He hath corrupted to himself, that they are not his children, that is, their blot*: nearly as intelligible as the version of Montanus.—It would be useless to rehearse all the attempts that have been made to make sense of this colon; I shall only mention one or two more. Delgado corrects our common version thus: “Did he destroy them wantonly? No; their spot is of his children”—that is, says he in a note, *the blame lieth on themselves who are his children*.—Dathe, after Lowth and Green §, takes נֶפֶשׁ to be the nom. of נֶפֶשׁ, and renders, *Corrupti illi filios, non jam suos, ipsorum protervitas*. He owns, however, that the Samaritan lection gives a more obvious, and perhaps (adds he) the genuine meaning. The Sam. reading is: שֶׁתָּהָם לֹא בְנֵי נֶפֶשׁ, without any manuscript variety of lection: by Houbigant, who adopts it, rendered, *Corrupti sunt, non sunt ejus, filii maculae*. In favour of all, or at least a part, of this reading, are most of the ant. versions. The Septuagint literally, Ἠμαρτίσθησαν αὐτοὶ ἀλλ’ οὐκ αὐτῶν τὰ κακὰ μωμήματα: in the old Ital. rendered, *Peccaverunt, non ei, filii maculati*.—Aquila and Sym. seem also to have read שֶׁתָּהָם, but they follow the order of the present Heb. in the two next words, לֹא בְנֵי; and the former read בְנֵי in his copy. Their versions are: Aq. Διαφθέραν αὐτοὶ ἀλλ’ οὐκ αὐτῶν τὰ κακὰ—Sym. Διαφθέραν παρὰ αὐτοὺς ἀλλ’ οὐκ αὐτῶν τὰ κακὰ—Jerom also read בְנֵי, and found לֹא before נֶפֶשׁ—*Peccaverunt ei, non filii ejus, &c.*—Of the other versions, Onk. Tharg. Syr. Arab. Erp. and Perf. appear to have read שֶׁתָּהָם in their copies; and most of them לֹא בְנֵי:

* In 2 Sam. 22. 32. they render the same word κρείσσεις. And Masius says that Theodotion, here, rendered κλαστής: but I find no such reading in Montfaucon.

† The various readings are these: 2 Sam. mss. have נֶפֶשׁ—I have נֶפֶשׁ upon a rasura—in 1 Sam. 16. 17. is wanting—and 1 had, at first, בְנֵי בְנֵי. All these are in Kennicott's collation.—De Rossi has; unaccountably, taken no notice of the passage.

‡ Down from Coverdale to James's revisers, with some variety in the mode of expression—Even Purver here imitates them: “These corrupt themselves; unlike his children, they have stains”—But Bate: “Corruption is on them: their spot is not his children's.” § “Their own depravity hath corrupted his children.”—He rejects, with Hare and Grey, one of the negatives; as the metre (that is, the Harian metre) admits but one,

although they differ in rendering the whole comma. What Saadias saw, it is not easy to say : but he read שָׁדַח in the sing. He read also לוֹ לֹא : but how he found בְּנֵי אֱמִילֹס (in *amicos ejus*) in the Heb. words בְּנֵי מִמֶּנּוּ, I cannot possibly conceive.—The Greek of Venice is a very literal version of the present Hebrew text ; save that its author seems to have read מִמֶּנּוּ instead of מִמֶּנּוּ. Εφθραγεν αὐτοὺς, οὐχ' ὑμῖς αὐτὰς, μισμοὺς αὐτοῦ*.

After an attentive inspection and comparison of all these versions, and of the readings of both texts, I am apt to think that the true reading ought to be made out of both ; namely, לוֹ לֹא בְנֵי מִמֶּנּוּ. My reasons for preferring this mixt reading are, 1. The nominative to the verb cannot, I think, be any other than בְּנֵי, or בְּנֵי : to make אֵל, from the preceding verse, the nominative is absurd, not to say impious. 2. Besides that all the ant. interpreters, save Sep. read בְּנֵי, the phrase בְּנֵי מִמֶּנּוּ, or even מִמֶּנּוּ בְּנֵי, seems to me uncouth and unwarranted ; and, if the reading לוֹ לֹא be the true one, as it appears to be, it would involve a contradiction. For the colon must be rendered thus : “ They have corrupted themselves, in his (God’s) regard ; “ they are *not* children of blemish : ” whereas it is evident from the context that they are *blemished*. The only objection which, I foresee, can be made to my arrangement, is, that מִמֶּנּוּ stands insulated, as it were, from the rest of the sentence. But a passage in Proverbs will, I presume, here help me out. It is in chap. 9. 7. which in the original runs thus : יָסַר לִי לִפְתָּח לֹא קָלָן ; וּמוֹכִיחַ לִרְשָׁע מִמֶּנּוּ ; where מִמֶּנּוּ is in the same insulated state as מִמֶּנּוּ is here.—Whether this will satisfy future critics, I know not ; but it is the best I have to give.—In my version, I have given what I deemed the *sentential*, not the *verbal*, meaning of my original : a meaning which, every reader must allow, perfectly corresponds with the context.

Ver. 8. Here is another difficult passage, that has very variously been interpreted. Our common version is : “ When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he “ separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the “ children of Israel.” That is (says Patrick), “ He made such a distribution to other people “ (particularly to the seven nations of Canaan) within such bounds and limits, as that there “ might be sufficient room for so numerous a people as the Israelites, when they came to take “ possession of the country †.”—The author of *Commentaries and Essays* justly rejects this interpretation ; and thinks that “ the passage would be clear and intelligible, if we were to under- “ stand מִמֶּנּוּ to refer, not to the *Gentiles*, but to the people of Israel. The meaning (says he) “ would then be, that when God, by his providential disposition of things, separated mankind “ into different nations, and appointed them their inheritance, he did then, in his foreknow- “ ledge, settle the bounds of the Hebrew people ; according to the number of the sons of “ Jacob : i. e. according to their twelve tribes. He then determined to divide the land among “ them, and in proportion to each tribe ; which appointment he had now revealed to them “ very particularly (see Num. xxxiv.), and thus had shown his peculiar regard to Israel, because “ he had chosen them for his own portion and inheritance.” To support this not unspecious interpretation, he shows, what cannot be doubted, that מִמֶּנּוּ “ is often used to denote a single “ people, and the people of Israel in particular ‡.”—But the question here is not, what מִמֶּנּוּ

* I was in the hopes of finding in Morell’s corrections, at the end of the volume, that αὐτοῦ was the reading of the ms. but I looked for it in vain : yet I think the Greek translator must have written αὐτοῦ. † This is yet a very common explanation ; followed by Schulz, Dathe, Rosenmüller, &c. ‡ More properly, the collective tribes of a people.

may sometimes signify; but what it signifies in this context: and I am clearly of opinion that it cannot have that signification which by this author is assigned to it.—But before I come to explain what I take to be the true meaning of the passage, let us see how it has been rendered by the antients; first exhibiting the original: **בְּחִדּוֹל עָלִים נָחַם בְּנֵי אָדָם יַעֲבֹד נְבִלּוֹת עֲמִים**: by Montanus, in his scrupulous and ridiculous manner, rendered, *In hæreditare faciendo excelsus gentes, in separare faciendo eum filios hominis, statuit terminos populorum ad numerum filiorum Israel*—Sep. *Ὅτε διμερίζῃς ὁ ὑψίστος ἄνθρωπον, ὡς διώκεις υἱὸς Ἀδάμ, ἐξῆσεν ἐξείας θύνας κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων Θεοῦ*. Their version is singular only in this, that instead of **בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, the sons of Israel, they seem to have read **בְּנֵי אֵל**, the sons of God; which in other places they render *ἀγγέλους*, angels. Gale thinks that, writing at Alexandria, they changed *the sons of Israel* into *the angels of God*; not to give offence to the Egyptians*. It has been supposed that in the Heb. copy which they used, the three first letters of **יִשְׂרָאֵל** had been omitted by the scribe, and **אֵל** only left: and this may possibly have been the case—although I hardly think it probable. However that be, all the other versions read as we do at present—Vulg. *constituit terminos populorum juxta numerum filiorum Israel*—So equivalently Onk. Tharg. Syr. Saad. Erp. Sam. ver. Perf. and Gr. Ven. whose literal version is, *ἐξῆσεν ἐξείας λέων εἰς ἀριθμὸν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*.—But, notwithstanding this uniformity of rendering, it is hard to make a connective and intelligible meaning out of such a translation. Hence, Houbigant imagined that a transposition had been made in the text, and would thus restore it: **יַעֲבֹד נְבִלּוֹת עֲמִים חֶלֶק יְהוָה יַעֲקֹב חֶבֶל נָחֳלוֹ**: **יִשְׂרָאֵל** *Constituit terminos populorum: pars Domini fuit Jacob, funis hæreditatis ejus Israel; quando partitus est Dominus populum suum, juxta numerum filiorum Israel*. But this is certainly a most unnatural, and in my opinion an unwarrantable, arrangement. Let us then stick to the present order, as it is in the Sam. copy, followed by the Septuagint; and try if we cannot make a more natural and consistent version than has yet been given. The Sam. lection is:

בְּחִדּוֹל עָלִים נָחַם	בְּחִדּוֹל עָלִים נָחַם
יַעֲבֹד נְבִלּוֹת עֲמִים	יַעֲבֹד נְבִלּוֹת עֲמִים
כִּי חֶלֶק יְהוָה עַם יַעֲקֹב	כִּי חֶלֶק יְהוָה עַם יַעֲקֹב
חֶבֶל נָחֳלוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל	חֶבֶל נָחֳלוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל

Which I have endeavoured to render as literally as possible in an intelligible version; but which Montanus would, in his barbarous Latin, render thus: “*In hæreditare faciendo Excelsus gentes, in separare faciendo eum filios hominis (vel Adami) statuit terminos populorum præter numerum filiorum Israel: Quia pars Domini populus ejus Jacob, funiculus hæreditatis ejus Israel.*”—The learned reader will readily see that this version arises chiefly from giving to the word **לְמִסְפָּר** a meaning almost contrary to that which is commonly ascribed to it; but which to me appears to be highly unsuitable. To justify mine own version, let it be observed, that the preposition **ל** has a great variety of meanings; and among others, that of *ab* and *præter*. Now any of these will here serve my turn; and give a consistency to the reason-

* “*Quæ res dedisse aliquod aurius Egyptiorum, quorum opinionem de divisione antiqua confirmare videretur. Simul et invidiam declinabant, docendo istam divisionem factam non juxta numerum filiorum Israel, quod Ægyptii haud commode admittent, sed juxta numerum angelorum, quod multo honestius sonaret.*” Gale, Notæ in Jamblich. p. 279. It is more probable that they had in view a common Jewish tradition, that God, in the division of the world, had assigned to each nation a particular guardian angel.

ing of Moses, which it has not as it is commonly rendered. For, what sort of connection is this: "God divided the nations according to the number of the sons of Israel, because Israel is his own portion," &c. ?—But give to לְמִסְפָּר the meaning which I think it here has, and see the consequence. "When God first divided the nations, he assigned to each particular portions, *except* to the children of Israel: because these, in due time, he meant to make his own proper inheritance." Compare the whole context with ch. 26. 3. and say if this interpretation be not highly plausible.—Indeed, if it be denied that לְמִסְפָּר can admit his meaning, I would prefer the translation of Sep. which gives at least an intelligible, consistent meaning, although it be founded perhaps on a false supposition; namely, that God, in dividing the nations, assigned to each a particular angel; but had reserved for his own particular superintendence and care his peculiar people Israel. That this idea prevailed among the Jews after the Babylonish captivity seems evident from the book called Ecclesiasticus, in which a manifest allusion is made to this very passage of Deuteronomy: "He appointed a ruler, ἡγεμῶνα, for every people, when he divided the nations of the earth: but he chose Israel as a peculiar people to himself," &c. Ecclus. 17. 15, 16.—Nay, I think it more than probable (with Theodoret, Jerom, and most of the antient fathers) that "the prince of the kingdom of Persia," in Daniel 10. 13. שַׂר מַלְכוּת פָּרְסָא, is no other than the tutelar angel of Persia. See Crit. Rem. on that place. The reading of Sep. then is far from being an improbable reading: at least, it is perfectly consistent with the context: whereas, if לְמִסְפָּר be rendered "according to the number," and not, as I have rendered, "exclusive of the number," I confess I think the present Heb. reading irreconcilable.

In ver. 9. I have had no hesitation in admitting into the text the addition "Israel," which is not only in the Sam. copies, but also in Sep. The parallelism seems to require it.

Ver. 10. *He provided for them in the wilderness.* The present Heb. has יִסְמְצוֹר, *He found him*, &c. But this is not true: he did not *find* them in the wilderness, but *brought* them into the wilderness*. The Sam. reading, יִסְמְצוֹר, is therefore preferable; unless we give to מְצָא a different meaning, which perhaps it admits, namely, *to find for one*; as we might say; that is, to provide for his necessities. Compare the Chald. and Syr. מְצָא and the Sam. מְצוֹר. The Septuagint have well rendered ἀνταρραχόντων αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ: and so equivalently Onk. and Saad.

In the arid deserts he fed them. I have here again followed the Sam. lesson, בְּתוֹלְלוֹת יִשְׁמְצוֹר, *in locis arenosis pinguius (i. e. lautè) eos aluit*.—And so partly Sep. ἐν ὄρεσι καυμάτων ἐν γῇ ἀνδρῶν.—The present Heb. has בְּתוֹלְלוֹת יִשְׁמְצוֹר, by our English translators rendered "in the waste howling wilderness:" that is, says the Bab. Tharg. a place "where dæmons and dragons howl." דְּמִיילֵךְ שִׂדִּין וְחִירָדָן. The other ant. interpreters seem to have guessed at some general vague meaning: nor is it certain how they read in their Heb. copies; except Gr. Ven. who gives this literal version: ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ὁλοφύρῳ φρονδῇ.—I have no doubt of the reading of

* Rosenmüller's argument in favour of the present reading seems to me a weak one: "Poëta hoc expressum; quia poëta, omittis pluribus sæculis, statim ad ea tempora transit, quibus Israelitæ, Nomadum more, Arabiam desertam pererrant. Igitur non querendum quomodo dici potest Deus invenisse populum suum in deserto, in quod eum ipse duxerat? Poëtam hic legimus, non scriptorem historicum."—Much is allowed to poets, to be sure—

*Sed non, ut placidis coeant immitia; non, ut
Serpentes avibus gementur, tigribus agni.*

Sam. being the true one. It was followed by Houbigant and Dathe; whose version is, *In locis aridis lautè eum aluit*.—I subjoin his sensible observation: “Verbum lectionis Sam. יִשְׁמַדוּ benè “respondet verbo prioris membri יִמְצְאוּ; atque Moses infra ver. 15. idem verbum, in eodem “sensu, de Israelitis adhibuit: *pinguis factus est Israel*.”

Ver. 13. *Honey*—דְּבַשׁ—Sep. and Gr. Ven. μέλι; and so equivalently most of the other versions: but the true meaning, I believe, is that given in the Bab. Thargum: אֲנִיךְ יִתֵּן דְּבַשׁ מִפֶּן מִצְרַח רִמְתִּיבִין עַל כִּיפֶן, *be nursed them with honey of his own fruits that grow on the rocks*.—I have little doubt of its being palm-honey*.

Ver. 14. *He made them drink*. The present text has תִּשְׁתֶּה—by our translators rendered *thou didst drink*: but all antient versions seem to have read either שָׁתָה or יִשְׁתֶּה; or considered the 2d person here as a Hebraism, which should be rendered in the third person. But I believe the true reading to be either הִשְׁתֶּה or הִשְׁתָּה, as the Syr. translator seems to have read; and whom I have followed in my version.

Ver. 15. *Jacob ate, and was satiated*. Who does not see, that this addition, which is in the Sam. copies and in Sep. is a beautiful part of the parallelism?

Ib. *Israel grew fat*. The Hebrew word is יִשְׁבֹּרַן, commonly pronounced *jesburun*; more properly *ishurun*: which by Sep. is rendered δὲ αγαπημενος—by Vulg. *dilectus*—by Saad. אֱלִימוֹצִי, *laudatus*—and by Arab. Erp. اَلْمُحَمَّدِي, a word of the same meaning—But Onk. Tharg. Syr. and Perf. have all *Israel*. But whether they read so in their Heb. copies, or changed יִשְׁבֹּרַן into a word which they deemed equivalent, it is hard to say; although (there being here no difference between the Heb. and Sam. copies) the latter supposition is the more probable.—But why did Moses here use an uncommon term to express the Israelitic people? and what is its meaning? Its meaning is by some lexicographers thought to be *plane rectus*, i. e. *rectissimus*; which the Septuagint and Jerom thought equivalent to *beloved*. But I am inclined to think, with Pagninus, Mercerus, and Grotius, that it is only a diminutive of *Israel*; and here used by the writer for the sake of his metre, or perhaps as a more tender epithet for a delicate and pampered people; as the Latins said, *animula, belhulus*. The Greek translator of Venice seems so to have understood it, and employs a very proper term to express its meaning, *Ισραηλισκος* †.

Ver. 24. *With bitter destruction*—רָקַב מְרִירָה—by Sep. rendered καὶ σπασθόντος αἰματος—The other versions vary. I think Jerom has well rendered the comma, *devorabunt eos aves morsu amarissimo*. Some moderns, referring the word רָקַב to the Arab. signification *cuspis*, render *sagitta amara*, i. e. say they, *the pestilence*. So Dathe: *absumpti ab avibus rapacibus et peste virulenta*. But we must not omit attending to the Sam. reading: רָקַב, without the prefix; which is also the reading of 9 or 10 Heb. mss. but with the prefix; and which is rendered in Pole *deserpet*; but which should, I think, be rendered substantively *descriptio*: and this was probably the reading which Jerom had before him.—What the Septuagint read, or saw in their reading, it is impossible to say. The word which they use, σπασθόντος, is supposed to be a *re-torted tension* of the muscles of the neck. Pliny says, in general, that any *dolor inflexibilis* was

* In the island of Madagascar there is a species of palm-tree called the *ragon*; under the membranous covering of the flowers of which is found a gummy substance of an exquisite taste, which one would take for honey.

† Rosenmüller thinks that the meaning of *jesburun* is to be sought in the Arab. يَسْرٍ, which, among other significations, has that of *happy*.

so called : and Hesychius defines it *ωνωνιον κυρτωμα*.—For the rest, Michaëlis has sufficiently shown that *רשף*, in the first part of this comma, signifies a *bird of prey* : and its being put in company with *wild beasts*, and *reptiles*, which immediately follow, evidently leads to that meaning.

Ver. 26. *I will extirpate them*—*מפניו*—Sep. *διωπησαι αυτους*—and so equivalently all the versions save Onk. Vulg. and Syr. who all read with Sam. *מפניו* in two words, although they differ in rendering *מפניו*. The two latter render *ubinam sunt? where are they?*—but Onk. *mine anger shall rest on them* :—and the Lat. translator of Sam. considered *מפניו* in the same sense, *ira mea sunt* : but the Sam. reading will bear to be rendered as Vulg. perhaps more properly.

Ver. 27. *The enemy*—*אויב*—and so all the versions ; but the Sam. copy has *אויבי*, *mine enemy*.

1b. Sam. instead of “their adversaries,” *אויביו*, has *אויבו*—Sep. seem to have read only *אויב*, without the affix : and Onk. perhaps read only *אויב*.

Ver. 35. *For a day of vengeance*. I follow the Sam. reading, *ליום נקם*, which is also that of Sep. *εν ημερα ενδικασιως*. The present Heb. has *למי נקם*, *mibi vindicta* ; or as Vulg. *mea est ultio* : and so equivalently the other versions : but the *לעם*, in the last member of the verse, seems decidedly in favour of the Sam. lesson.

1b. *And retribution*—*שלם*—So both texts, without any various reading, save that one of Kennicott's mss. has *שלום*, *plene*.—But Sep. seem to have read *שלום*, *αποταμιωσας* ; and so it is quoted in the New Testament more than once. Nay, Onk. Tharg. Syr. Vulg. and even Gr. Ven. appear all to have had before them the same reading : but both Arabs. and Perf. read *שלם*, and considered *שלם* as a noun ; but a noun in concordance. I am persuaded that it is a noun in regimen ; and that the whole verse is intimately connected with the preceding one.

Ver. 37. *Where now (will be say) are your gods?*—*איהם אלהים* ; a Hebraism for *אלהיהם*. Comp. ver. 38. where the last two pronouns are in the second person.—The Sam. copy has here *ואמר*, in the plural ; as if the words were the words of the enemies of Israel ; and so they were understood by Saadiah, although he read in the singular.—But Sep. either read, or supplied, *יודו* after *אמר* : *και ουτε Κυριος* : and there is no doubt of this being the proper supplement.

Ver. 41. The last comma of this verse has, I think, been generally misunderstood and misinterpreted. The version of Sep. is *απο κεφαλαις αρχατων εχθρων**—Vulg. *nudati inimicorum capitis*†—Onk. *מריש סמאח ובעל דבנא*—and so equivalently Tharg. Bab. Syr. Arab. Exp. and Perf. —Saadiah, *מן ריש פראענה אלאעדא*, *from the heads of rebellious enemies*. This variety of rendering the word *פרעות* shows, that its real meaning is hard to be ascertained. Hence the moderns are not less divided than the antients‡. I have endeavoured to fix its original signification in another place § :—in the supposition that I have fixed it right, let us see what consistent sense will arise out of the whole comma. In the first place, it is evident that the poet intended a parallelism : hence Houbigant conjectured, that the first two commas of the verse had shifted places, and that a slight alteration had taken place in the comma now in question. Instead of

* The same idea seems to have occurred to the Jerusalem Thargumist.

† So Gr. Ven. *απο του κεφαλαι*

αποκαλυπτειν εχθρου. ‡ The greater part of modern interpreters give to it the signification of *vengeance*. So our common English version : “from the beginning of revenges upon the enemy.” So Purver : “from the first revenge on the enemy.” But Baté : “for all the injuries of the enemy.” Our earlier English versions may be seen in Cruden's edition ; commonly called Bishop Wilton's Bible.

§ Remarks on the Song of Debora.

וְרִאשׁוֹ he reads רִאשׁוֹ, and forms his version thus: *Gladus meus bauriet carnes; sagittis meis sanguine inebriabo; sanguine interfectorum et captivorum; carne impij et inimici*. This conjecture is acknowledged by Schulz to be a probable one: to me it appears in a different light.—Green finds an *hyperbaton* in the verse, and transposes thus: “I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, with the blood of the slain and of the captives: and my sword shall devour flesh from the hairy head of the enemy.”—I see no need for either altering or transposing the text, which is the same in all the copies, and was read by all the antients: but then I think בָּשָׂר is evidently to be understood before וְרִאשׁוֹ; by which the parallelism is complete; and more beautiful, in my opinion, in its hyperbatic form, than by any transposition that could be made. See my version.

Ver. 43. There is in Sep. a singular addition at the beginning of this verse: *Εὐφρανθήτε ουρανοὶ αἶμα αὐτῶ, καὶ προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἀγγέλοι Θεοῦ* the first comma of which is quoted by Paul, Rom. 15. 10; the last by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews i. 6. Yet there is not a vestige of either in the Heb. and Sam. texts, nor in any other antient version.

Ib. *Rejoice, thou nation, his people*—וְרִנְנוּ בָיָם עַמּוֹ without any variety of reading, save that one, perhaps two mss. have נָם before עַמּוֹ. The comma, however, has been variously rendered. Sep. *εὐφρανθήτε ἐθὴ μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*: followed by our last translators: “Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people*!” But our more early versions, following the Latin Vulgate, have: “Praise, ye heathen, his people!” or, “Ye nations, praise his people!” And a similar rendering is placed in the margin of our vulgar version.—Vulg. *Laudate, gentes, populum ejus!* followed by Pagninus, the Tigurines, Geneva, Bruccioli, De Valera, Castalio, Le Clerc, Houbigant, Dathe, &c.—And so equivalently the antient interpreters, Onk. Syr. Saad. and Perf. are made to speak in their Latin versions. But I am convinced these versions are erroneous; and that their originals should be rendered, not *Laudate, gentes, populum ejus!* but *Canite, gentes, populus ejus!* as the Bab. Tharg. has very properly paraphrased: וְרִנְנוּ שְׂבָרָו אֹמִיָּה עַמּוֹ בֵּית לְיִשְׁרָאֵל: *Rejoice and sing, ye peoples, his own people, the house of Israel!*—So also Aquila and Theodotion: *αὐτοποιήσατε ἐθὴ, λαὸς αὐτοῦ—αγαλλιασθε ἐθὴ, λαὸς αὐτοῦ*—and still more explicitly, and better, Gr. Ven. *αἰδολαῖε ἐθὴ, λαὸς αὐ.*—This meaning did not escape the sagacious Luther, who has well expressed the meaning: “Jauchzet alle, die ihr sein volk seid”—Michaëlis: “Heiden, die ihr sein volk seyd, freuet euch”—and Rosenmüller: *Gentes, quæ nunc estis ejus populus.*—Not badly Purver: “Sing, O nations, you his people!”—More literally the Spanish of Ferrara; “Cantad, gentes, su pueblo!”—I have no doubt of this being the genuine meaning. That בָּיָם, although a plural, is applicable to the single people of Israel, is clear from Ezek. 2. 3. which the reader is requested to inspect.—There is here in Sep. another addition; *καὶ προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες τὰς Θεοῦ*: so Comp. Rom. and Alex.† but Ald. several mss. and the Coptic version have *ἀγγέλοι Θεοῦ*.

Ib. *The land of his own people*. So the Sam. text, *עַד אֶרֶצוֹ*: and so Sep. *עַד גִּבְרָתוֹ* *του λαου αὐτου*—and Vulg. *terre populi sui*. The present Heb. has *עַד אֶרֶצוֹ*, by our English translators rendered, “unto his land and to his people.” And Onk. Syr. both Arabs. Perf. seem to have so read in their copies; unless perhaps a *vau* have been dropt out of the text; which may

* Junius, Diodati, the Dutch, Le Cene, Le Gros, have all similar versions.
among the copies which have *ἀγγέλοι*.

† Wrongly marked by Bos

have been אֱלֹהֵינוּ תָּמִיד.—But Gr. Ven. clearly read as we do at present, having $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ του $\lambda\epsilon\omega\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$. I think the Sam. lection preferable.

C H A P. XXXIII.

THERE are great beauties in this chapter, and most sublime passages; but there are, at the same time, many difficulties to encounter, in properly rendering them. That I have overcome them all, it would be presumption to affirm: I can only say, that I have done my best.

Ver. 2. presents a beautiful metaphor, drawn from the progressive motion and effects of the sun*. The last colon has been variously understood, and I think generally misinterpreted. The Heb. is: וָאֵתָּוָה מִיְּמֵינוּ אֵשׁ דֵּת לָמוֹ; by Montanus rendered: *et venit a decem milibus sanctitatis: a dextra ejus ignis lex eis*; and by our English translators: "and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them:" which version whoever understands must have a wonderful comprehension. And yet, strange to say, not one of the antient versions is much more intelligible: as the curious reader may convince himself by turning to his Polyglott. I shall here content myself with giving the version of the Septuagint, and that of Jerom, because the former is singular in the rendering of some words, and both, with respect to another word, confirm the Sam. lection; of which presently.—Sep. $\sigma\omega\ \mu\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\sigma\sigma\iota\ \text{Καθ'}$, $\epsilon\kappa\ \delta\epsilon\ \xi\iota\omega\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ †. They considered $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ as a proper name; and took דֵּת אֵשׁ or דֵּת אֵשׁ to be a metaphorical expression for *angels*.—Vulg. *Et cum eo sanctorum millia. In dextera ejus lex ignea*. It is clear that they both followed the Sam. reading, אֵשׁ; and so did Onk. and Syr.: but all of them, I think, mistook the meaning of it, considering it as a compound of אֵשׁ and י: whereas I believe it to be the third person plural of the verb אָתָּוָה.—The other translators, who had the present Heb. before them, also considered אֵשׁ as a verb: but, at a loss to find a nominative for it, they refer it to the preceding דֵּת, with which the ode begins. Hence their versions are embarrassed and incongruous. Take for example that of Gr. Ven. the most literal that can well be made: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\phi\iota\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\varsigma\ \tau\omega\varsigma\ \mu\alpha\tau\iota\alpha\delta\omega\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omega\upsilon\sigma\iota\ \epsilon\kappa\ \delta\epsilon\ \xi\iota\omega\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\omega\varsigma\ \nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\tau\ \sigma\phi\iota\sigma\iota\upsilon$.

As all these translations are evidently forced and unnatural, modern criticism has long laboured to find more suitable interpretations; either by correcting the text itself, or by explicating new meanings for some particular words out of the text as it at present stands. Of the latter class of critics are our Durell and Green. The former makes $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ the nominative to אָתָּוָה, and thinks it means here the *Holy-one*. He thinks מִיְּמֵינוּ means the house of Israel; and renders the first comma thus: "And the Holy-one came with multitudes." He then reads אֵשׁ דֵּת, in one word, with a great number of mss. and renders the second comma thus: "From his right hand issued streams to them." He means *streams* of light.—Green makes the preceding דֵּת the nom. to אָתָּוָה, but, with Sep. makes $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ a proper name; and, supplying the pre-

* "Observe perpetuam metaphoram a sole desumptam, qui initio lucem præmittit, (אֵשׁ) postea oritur ipse, (דֵּת) tandem terras illustrat, (דֵּת) et totum coelum percurrit, (אֵשׁ). Sic gradatim Deus præsentiam suam in populo declaravit, quacunq; iter fecit, inde a termino Ægypti, usque ad fines Canaanæ." Rosenmüller.—I think the last word (אֵשׁ) is misplaced, and belongs not to the metaphor.

† Houbigant fancied that, for these three words אֵשׁ דֵּת אֵשׁ they read אֵשׁ דֵּת אֵשׁ, *legati* (i. e. *angeli*) cum eo—from the Chald. אֵשׁ, *missere*.

position is before it, he renders the first comma thus: "and marched with *his* ten thousand "men from Kadesh:" and the second comma he renders: "Fire from his right hand was a "signal to them." That is (says he), Fire proceeding from the right hand of the cloud of glory was a signal to the Israelites, when to strike their tents and march forward, and when to pitch again. He refers to a passage in Habakkuk 3. 5. "He had beams of light issuing from his "hand."—On the whole, a plausible version, especially if דת were certainly a *signal*; and in the supposition that דת דא, in two words, were the right reading, I should be inclined to think that this is the true meaning: for, why not admit in this piece of poetry a Syriaism, as well as a Chaldaism, which those interpreters are obliged to do who render דת an *edict* or *law*?

Le Clerc makes דא the nominative to דתא, and joins the two commas thus: "Atque à "myriadibus sanctis venit eis ignis, à dextra ejus:" a version justly derided by Houbigant; whose own version shall be examined by and by.

Dathe takes a singular method to explain his text. He construes the word דתא with דא, and thinks that it means *to stand at one's right hand*, in order to protect one: "*stare ad dextram alicujus*, pro, *adesse ad alicujus defensionem*." By דתא דא he supposes the Israelites to be designated; and thus renders the two commas: "Profectus est cum myriadibus lectissimis exercitus, ad ejus defensionem, columna nubis eis prævit."—This is certainly a strange paraphrase, which, I believe, has not been followed by any posterior critic.

Rosenmüller will have דתא דא to be God's own heavenly residence, "*ubi magna angelorum cohoris ipsi adstat*." His version is: *Venit a myriadibus sanctis; a dextra ejus columna ignis eis*. But does דת ever mean a *pillar*, or *column*?—Lentz* has endeavoured to prove that it does: but his proofs, although deemed probable by Dathe, appear to me feeble and fallacious. He derives דת from דת, *tendi, protendi*: whence *protensio*, and whence *columna protensa*. Who does not perceive that this is a forced derivation? Much better say with Green, that it is derived from דתא, which in Syr. signifies a *sign*, and might without much straining be applied to the cloudy *pillar* of the Pentateuch. But it is not at all probable, that Moses would denominate that pillar by any other term than עמוד, which is so often used in Exodus and Numbers, and for which no other word is ever substituted.

Delgado, after Aben-ezrah, thinks that דת דא means a *constant fire*; and refers to the Chaldee for this signification: but although דת in Chaldee signifies an *edict*, *statute*, *law*; it can signify *constant* only in a metaphorical sense, in as far as laws are *standing* edicts: and here such a metaphor can hardly, I had almost said cannot possibly, have place†.

Michælis, making one word of דתא, gives us this rendering: "Begleitet von heiligen "beeren, und zu seiner rechten wassergüsse."

We come now to those critics, who have attempted to give plausible interpretations, by correcting the text. Among these the first is Houbigant. He justly observes that דת דא, even admitting the Chaldee signification of דת, cannot signify a *law of fire*: in order to make out that meaning, the words should be transposed. But, independently of this (says he), if

* Observat. Miscel. in Sylloge Dissertationum, Leidæ 1775, p. 1010, 1011, 1012.

† Yet this interpretation pleased Teller, who renders *ignem perpetuatum*. See his Preface to his Latin version of Kennicott's Second Dissertation, p. xv.

were the reading, "*Quale erit istud legis attributum? Nunquam Moses neo legem dixit igneam, nec verbo דת-attitur, ut significet legem; et infra ver. 4. equitator lex per verbum נורה, addiberi solitum.*"—Now for his own conjecture. He supposes, that the right reading of דת לש is דת לש, *fatagentes ei*; from the same Chaldee root from which he supposed the Septuagint derived their version.—Or (adds he) we may appeal to the Arabic *amar, agile, huf,* "quod convenire angelis Deo astantibus nemo non videt."—To the objection that might be made to his having recourse to *one* Chaldee term, after having rejected *another*, he answers: "Non sunt ista familia: sexcenties venit *lex Dei* in Pentateucho nomine *amar*, *contra* quam nusquam verbo דת, ne in libris quidem Esdræ ac Nehemiz, post Bab. captivitatem scriptis, nisi ut significetur edictum regis; non autem ut *lex Dei*." All this is well; but does not a similar reasoning hold good against his דת לש? Where are God's angels, either before or after the captivity, called by that name? Houbigant himself, however, gives not here his conjectural emendation without some doubt. "Feliciorem conjecturam (says he) adhibebit, si quis poterit."

Dr. Kennicott, finding in the Sam. version נור אור, imagined that the original reading of the Heb. text was אור, and in his First Dissertation, p. 428, he formed his version accordingly. But, modestly admonished by Teller, and illiberally reproved by the flippant French abbé De Villefroi*, he seems to have changed his mind: as in his posthumous Remarks (p. 84.) he gives us the common version, "From his right hand *went* a fiery law for them."

It is now time to come to my own version, which, perhaps, will meet with the fate of those of my predecessors; and be rejected by some future critic, to make way for his.—I change nothing in the text, but upon manuscript authority. I indeed follow the Sam. copy, and arrange the text thus: ואור מרבבות קדש' מימנו אסדות למר. We have not only the authority of Sam. for אור, but of Sep. Valg. Onk. Syr. who all must have found אור, not אור, or אור, (which is the reading of several mss.) in their Hebrew exemplars. I have more than once already remarked, that the ה and ו have been often interchanged, from their resemblance in the ancient alphabet.—In the next place, I read מרבבות, with Sam. and not less than 78 mss.—Thirdly, I read מימנו, with Sam. and 1 ms.—Fourthly, I read אסדות, in one word, with Sam. and more than 50 mss.—I reject דת לש, not merely because דת is a Chaldee term; but, both because it is a novel Chaldee term, and never used, not even here, by Onkelos or the Targumists; and because דת לש cannot with any grammatical propriety be rendered *a fiery law*. To resume, then, in an inverse order, אסדות can mean nothing else than *streams* of water; particularly such as issue from rocks or mountains. We have now a proper nominative to the verb אור; and we have only to explore the meaning of מימנו and מרבבות. The learned and most ingenious Mr. Bradley thinks that מרבבות is the same with מריבה, מריבת, or מריבות; for so it is written in

* See his fourth Letter, p. 89 of the French edition; where the author, in displaying his ill-natured wit against Kennicott, betrays his own gross ignorance of the subject on which he is treating. Witness what he says of the Sam. version, p. 92 and 93. "Le second mot est נור (*nour*), qui signifie en Hebreu une lanterne, et dans le Chaldéen du feu. "Le troisième est אור (*aura*), qui veut dire lumière. Enfin le quatrième est לך (*laun*), qui veut dire léger l'en fort "que réunissant ces quatre termes, je trouve que ce passage signifie: Elle loge dans sa main droite une lanterne, ou un feu "de lumière. La version Samaritaine nous a conservé là une belle idée. Je vous en fais mon compliment, et encore plus "de la richesse de votre trouvaille." What petulant ignorance! The man did not know that לך in the Sam. dialect is the same with לכו in Hebrew. The word in Sam. which corresponds with the Heb. לך is לך, is לך. —Such is the strength of this critical Hercules!

Ezek. 47. 19. and even joined with the same word קדש which follows it here. Hence he would make the two words the name of a place, and render: *From his right hand came streams for them from Meriboth-Kedesh, or Meriba-Kadefh.* And this explanation once pleased Kennicott (1 Dissert. p. 423.) and archbishop Secker (in his ms. notes). There are, however, two objections to it. First, there wants the preposition מ. This indeed, it may be replied, may have been dropt, from its contiguity with the following מ: but this is, at least, improbable: nor is there a vestige to be found of it in any ms. or any of the antient versions. Secondly, the word is uniformly written with a double *beth*: and so read all the antients, referring it not to מרב, from which the name of מריבה is derived, but to רבב. Suppose, then, this latter to be the root; רבב, or רבבת, will denote a copious quantity of any thing; and more especially a copious quantity of water. See the Arab. راب. —All this granted, I am myself convinced that the true meaning of the words is what I have given in my version: “and from whose right hand came streams of water for them from the copious springs of Kadefh.” —I had almost forgotten to observe, that the Syr. translator must have read in his copy not משה, as Secker conjectured; but either משה or משה; mistaking, as was easily done, a *thau* for an *be*: but still he considered משה as the radix of the word, as he renders it משה.

This has been a long Remark: I shall try to be more brief in future.

Ver. 3. *O loving Father of the people!* The present text has אף חבב עמים—commonly rendered, “*Yea, he loved the people*”—by Green, “*Doubtless, he loved his people.*” How frigid, when compared with the Sam. lection אב חבב עמים*, which, with Durell, I have followed in my version. —By עמים are evidently meant the tribes of Israel, as Onk. well renders: although Kennicott, after Houbigant, labours to prove that by עמים are meant the nations at large, and that the passage relates to the Messiah. His version is, “*Truly he loveth the nations*” —The Septuagint seem to have read עמי or עמי: as they render τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 4. *The law which thou hast enjoined to us.* In the present both Heb. and Sam. texts we read תורה צוה לנו משה—lit. *legem præcepit nobis Moses*—or, as our vulgar version, “*Moses commanded us a law.*” But how such a parenthesis could be pronounced by Moses himself, it is not easy to conceive. If then it be not an interpolation, explanative of מבריתך, I cannot see how it can accord with the context; unless the word משה, *Moses*, be excluded. See Dr. Kennicott’s First Dissertation on the State of the Hebrew Text, p. 434. The Doctor supposes that משה or משה may have been inadvertently thrust into the text, from its similarity to the following word מורשה. I should rather think that מורשה, or מורשה (which is the reading of 16 mss.), was originally repeated in the text, and that we should read תורה צוה לנו מורשה מורשה: “*He enjoined us a law for an inheritance, an inheritance of, or for, the people of Jacob.*” This is quite in the Hebrew style; more emphatical in itself, and, I think, more agreeable to the nature of poetical composition. I need not warn the intelligent reader, that, in this whole ode, the 2d and 3d persons are frequently interchanged, according to the idiom of the Hebrew language. I have uniformly rendered in the second person, when the words of Moses are immediately addressed to God.

Ver. 6. *Let Reuben live, and not die; although his men be but few in number.* The last member of this verse in the original runs thus: וידו מרו מספר. Instead of מרו the Sam. copy

* It is but fair to observe, however, that 6 Sam. mss. have אף; and that probably all the antients so read in their copies.—For the rest, 4 Heb. mss. have ורובב; and in another the ו seems to have been effaced.

has מְעַט, which the Septuagint are supposed to have followed in their version, και ισχυα πολυς εν αριθμω—Vulg. *et fit parvus in numero*—"Ineptè, (says Dathe) quia tum esset imprecatio, non "bonum votum." Not so, if compared with the former comma. Only the 1 should in Latin have been rendered not *et*, but *sed*. The benediction evidently alludes to the small number of the Reubenites, compared with the other tribes. See my Explanatory Note.—Most of the versions, however, give a different meaning to the comma; namely, "let his number be "great:" but this appears to me but ill to accord with the previous wish, "Let him live, and "not die:" which is evidently equivalent to *Let him not be entirely extinguished*. In Isa. 10. 19. מְעַט clearly signifies *a small number*: and why מְעַט וְיָרֶוּ should not have a similar meaning, I can see no good reason, if the context seem to require it*.—Le Clerc and Michaëlis, by pointing וְיָרֶוּ differently, make out this meaning: *sint mortui ejus pauci*—"let his dead be few." And Gr. Ven. seems to have understood the word in the same sense, τελευτοιαν ὁ δὲ θνητοι οὐ αριθμος.—Still I think the other meaning preferable.

It is strange that there is no mention made of Simeon, in either the Sam. or Heb. texts; nor in any of the versions: save that some copies of Sep. have Συμεων between και and εσται†.—See Sabatier.

Ver. 7. *And bring him back*—וְיָבִיאוּ. But Sep. seem to have read וְיָבִיאוּ, as they render ελθεις αν, or εισελθεις αν: if indeed either of these be their true reading. Ald. Compl. and perhaps some other copies have ελθουσιν†, in one word; and in Montfaucon, this is said to be also the rendering of Aquila: but this is clearly a mistake. See Scharfenberg, p. 142.

Ver. 10. *Before thee*—בְּפָנַי, or, as 20 mss. בְּפָנֶיךָ, which, perhaps, is the better reading. The meaning is disputed. By Sep. it is rendered εν οργη σου—So also Vulg. *in furore tuo*—and so equivalently Syr. both Thargums, and Gr. Ven. But Onk. both Arabs. and Perf. have words that denote *before thee*, or *in thy presence*: and this I believe to be the better rendering. The other is, however, plausible; and may be referred to what is recorded in Numb. 16. 46. which see.

Ver. 11. *So that they may rise no more*—וְיִסְחוּ יָדָם—Sep. μη ανασηκωσωσαν—Vulg. *non confurgant*—and so the other versions.—But Sam. has וְיִסְחוּ יָדָם.

Ver. 12. *May the SUPREME continually protect him*. The present Heb. has only יְהוָה עֲלָיו כָּל הַיּוֹם §—by our English translators rendered, "*and the Lord shall cover him all the day long*:" supplying the words in Italic. I am of opinion, with Dathe, Herder, and Rosenmüller, that the first עֲלָיו was originally עָלָיו, and that it belongs to the following comma, יְהוָה עֲלָיו כָּל הַיּוֹם עָלָיו. So

* Houbigant thinks, that וְיָרֶוּ has been dropt out after וְיָרֶוּ. † Rosenmüller and Dathe mistake, in saying that this addition is only in Cod. Alex. It is also in Ald. and Comp. But it is wanting in Rom. and in Ambr. Canon. and Glasg. mss.; and is not only not quoted by the Greek fathers, but by some of them expressly said to be wanting in the correct copies of Sep. Nor is it in the Coptic version.—We shall soon, it is to be hoped, see, whether any of Dr. Holmes's mss. have it.

‡ The Canon. ms. reads thus: εισελθουσιν οι χειρες αυτου, και διακριουσιν. κ. τ. λ. The Glasg. ms. has a sing. reading, ελθουσιν.—On the whole, ελθεις, or εισελθεις αν, is most probably the genuine reading. It was easy, as Nobilius remarks, for ελθεις αν to be run into one word, ελθουσιν: whereas, to make the latter the true reading, we must say that they read in their Heb. copy, not וְיָבִיאוּ, but וְיָבִיאוּ, or וְיָבִיאוּ.

§ Three mss. have וְיָרֶוּ; and Sam. has וְיָרֶוּ. The first עֲלָיו is wanting in Sam. and the second עֲלָיו in 4 Heb. mss. Dathe adds, that the ancient interpreters omit it also. But this is a mistake. It was read by them all. But Syr. with Sam. omits the first עֲלָיו. See the Polyglott. Gr. Ven. has most literally περιποιουσιν εν αυτου, σκεπων εν αυτου κ. τ. λ.

equivalently Sep. ὁ Θεὸς σκιαζέει ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι τὰς ἡμέρας. "Quæ lectio (says Dathe) valde "probabilis videtur. Primo enim hoc עליו non admittit explicationem, quoniam subjectum non "est Jova, sed Benjamin dilectus Jovæ. Deinde, tria membra sibi melius respondent."—I am, however, inclined to think that, by following the Sam. reading, another probable rendering may be given; namely, "May the beloved of the Lord rest in security; and may he (the Lord) be "his protector at all times* 1"

Ib. *And dwell between his shoulders*—וּבֵין כְּתָפָיו סֹבֵן—Sep. καὶ ἀναμυσθὼν τῶν ὤμων αὐτοῦ κοιτῶναι—Vulg. *et inter humeros illius requiescet*—And so equivalently the other versions; except Onk. and Tharg. who paraphrase thus: *and in his land, or limits, shall the majesty of the Lord reside*: alluding no doubt to the temple of Jerusalem; which was partly in the borders of Benjamin.—This idea has been embraced by Dathe and Rosenmüller: *et inter montes ejus confideat* †.

Ver. 14: To what I have said in Explanatory Note, I shall here only add Dathe's version, with Rosenmüller's short scholium: "Propter fructus optimos qui gignuntur beneficio solis, "propter fructus optimos, qui singulis mensibus nascuntur."—"Proventus solis (says Rosenmüller) sine dubio sunt fructus qui semel tantum intra solarem periodum proveniunt, ut "vinum, triticum, hordeum: quibus opponuntur *protrusiones lunarum*: i. e. fructus qui plus "semel in anno, aliquot lunæ periodis colliguntur, ut fœnum, oliva, ficus, in Palestina, paucis "mensibus exceptis."

Ver. 19. *From treasures bidden in the sand*—שֵׁנִי טֶסֶן דָּחַל—Sep. ἐμπορία παραλίων κατοικούντων—But better Vulg. *et thesauros absconditos arenarum*.—So Onk. and the other versions, except Syr. which has *and ships bidden in the sand*: if indeed מֵלֶכֶת here means *ships*, which I am inclined to doubt: why not *thousands*; i. e. very great riches ‡?—which will accord with the *treasures* of the other versions.—Most literally, as usual, Gr. Ven. κεκαλυμμένα κεκρυμμένα ψαμμοθάλασσα.

Ver. 21. *Therefore he seeth, &c.* The present Heb. runs thus: וְיָרָא רִאשִׁית לוֹ כִּי שָׁם וְהָלַקְתָּ וְיִשְׂרָאֵל עִם מִדְּוָקָא שֶׁפָּן וְיָרָא רִאשִׁי. By our English translators rendered: "and he provided the first part for himself, because there, in a portion of the lawgiver, was "he feasted; and he came with the heads of the people, he executed the justice of the Lord, "and his judgments with Israel."—Which if any one understand, he has a clearer intellect than mine. Indeed, it is, in my opinion, impossible to make sense of the text as it stands. Hence the strange diversity among the ant. interpreters. Sep. καὶ εἶδεν ἀπαρχὴν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐμεσθῆν γὰρ ἀρχόντων ἀντιπροσώπων αἰμα ἀρχηγῶς λαῶν κ. τ. λ.—Vulg. *Et vidit principatum suum, quod in parte sua doctor esset repositus: qui fuit cum principibus populi, &c.*—Onkelos here wildly paraphrases to this purport: "At the beginning he shall receive his portion; because there, in his

* Durell, adopting the Sam. יָרָא, instead of יָרָא, renders the verse thus: "The hand, even the hand of the Lord, "shall dwell in safety upon him: it covers him all the day long, and dwells upon his shoulders." Few critics, I think, will acquiesce in this version.

† "Vox סֹבֵן proprie sunt humeri: hic autem poetice ita dicantur montes. Simili translatione Hebræi dixerunt montes gibbosus. Intelliguntur montes Zion et Moria, qui ad tribum Benjamin "pertinebant." Rosenmüller in loc.—But Michaëlis follows the old track: "und wohnet auf seinem schultern."—Our Green renders: "and he shall dwell within his borders"—And so Batc.

‡ Unless perhaps *ships* may be said to be hidden in the sands, in as far as they are moored in low sandy shores.

§ Sam. has וְיָרָא; and there are some other various readings of little moment.

"inheritance, Moses, the great scribe and chief of Israel, was buried; and he went out and went in before the people," &c.—Still wilder, but of the same nature, is the *Thargum*,—and not dissimilar are the versions of Syr. and Saadiah.—Even Gr. Ven. is tinged with the same notion; although he renders more literally: *Εἶδε δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ μερὶς τοῦτον τοῦ ἐστρατομένου καὶ ἐβράβευσεν κεφαλὰς λαὸν κ. τ. λ.*

What modern critics have done to heal the sore, will appear from some of their versions, from Le Clerc downward.

Le Clerc. "Vidit sibi primitias, qui illic parte legislatoris cohonestatus est; venit cum capitibus populi," &c.

Houbigant. "Providit sibi primitias, ubi partem a legislatore flagitavit, cum populi principibus," &c.

Dathe. "Primitias terre promissæ sibi expetiit, ibique in portione statuta cum dignitate vivet: sed antea præcedet populum," &c.

Michaëlis. "Er sieht schon einen anfang, denn hier ist ein erbtheil, rechtmässig, und beneidet: Voran vordem volk wird ergehen," &c.

Hezel. "Sicht nur einen anfang für sich, dort aber noch ein land eines trügrischen fürsten, kommt unter die häupter des volks," &c.

Purver. "He also looks the first for himself, because he is covered there as the part of the lawgiver, and comes with the heads of the people," &c.

Bate. "And he shall provide a chief part for himself, for there shall be the sway of a studded sceptre, and he shall restrain the heads of the people," &c.

Durell. "For he provided the first part for himself: when there in the decreed portion he was secured, then he went with the heads of the people," &c.

Green. "He hath provided a principal part for himself; for there was he settled in his portion by the lawgiver. But he shall march with the heads of the people," &c.

It would be tedious to accumulate here all the arguments which these authors adduce in support of their respective versions. I shall content myself with those of Dathe, as they are, in my opinion, the most plausible of all. Here then is the essence of his note: "*Liceat mihi meam asserre conjecturam, et versionem suprapositam explicare. Adverbium loci שם, ibi, emollit, ut spero, duritiem ellipsis præpositionis ב ante חלקת. Participium activum קקח, quod ex meo sensu paullo durius, vel de Mosè, vel de Gado, explicatur, ego passivè lego; et, quoniam cum חלקת construitur, in læminino סחלקת, ne quem offendat enallage generis, cujus tamen quamplurima exempla sunt in lingua Hebræa. Tandem שם, ex usu hujus vocis in ling. Chald. explico, et ad Gadum refero. Sic evito alteram enallagem generis, quæ statuta est, si שם cum חלקת construitur. Quod si quis illis generis enallagis non offenditur, possunt etiam verba illa verti: Ibi portio statuta ei est: s. manet specabilis. Sic non opus est ellipsi præpositionis ב.*" The only fault of this exposition, adopted by Rosenmüller, is, that it is too ingenious; and makes postulates which will not be easily granted.

I will now risk my emendation of the text, and my version made in consequence. The emendation is a very small one: it consists, 1st, in withdrawing a single letter from the beginning of one word, and adding it to the end of the preceding word. Instead of שם חלקת I read שמה לקח. I suspect, indeed, that the original reading was בשמה לקח: but as there is no absolute

lute necessity for this alteration, I let כִּי stand as it is. I am also inclined to think that a מ has been dropt from the beginning of מִדְּקָק: but neither is this addition necessary; for דְּקָק has the same meaning as מִדְּקָק. See Jud. 5. 9. and Isa. 22. 16. 2dly, The transposition of a single letter being, as before, made, I take לָקַח to be the verb לָקַח, which, though not elsewhere used in Hebrew, has in Arabic the same signification with לָקַח; only is more emphatical, and here more properly used. Its meaning is *to receive immediately*, and without reserve: which was exactly the case of the tribe of Gad; to whose name (*Lucky*) there is most probably an allusion here intended. I might avail myself of the rules of criticism, and say that perhaps לָקַח was the original reading; and that the מ had been changed into a נ; a change most easily made: but I content myself with לָקַח as it is, in the meaning which I have just now mentioned. I next consider סֶפֶת as a noun, as it is in 1 K. 6. 15.—7. 7.—in Jerem. 22. 14.—Hag. 1. 4.—and סֶפֶת in Jonah is to be considered in the same sense; that is, *a covering, a protection, a shelter*.—These preliminaries granted, a literal version may be framed thus: “Ergo, vidit primam portionem sibi datam: cum lætus recipit a decernente tegmen: attamen ibit primus populi, justitiam Domini faciens et judicia propter Israelem.”—See my English version, and Explan. Notes, and compare Num. 32. 25, 34, 35, 36.

Ver. 23. For an account of the fertility of Galilee, where the tribes of Naphthali and Issachar had their inheritances, see Josephus De Bell. Jud. lib. iii. c. 3. Pococke, Arvieux, Troilo, and other travellers in the East.

Ver. 27. The first part of this verse has been wonderfully misunderstood and misrendered. The words are: מְעוֹנָה אֱלֹהִים קִדְּם וּמִתַּחַת חֲזָרְתָּ עִלָּם*—by Sep. rendered καὶ ὑπὸ πτερύγεσσι αὐτοῦ ἀσπασαί, and ὑπὸ πτερύγεσσι αὐτοῦ ἀσπασαί—Vulg. *Habitaculum ejus sursum, et subter brachia sempiterna*—Onk. שְׁמֵי שְׁמֵי מְעוֹנָה וְחֲזָרְתָּ מִתַּחַת וּבְסִמְרִיָּה אֲתַעְבֵּד עִלָּם—Syr. קִדְּם וְחֲזָרְתָּ מִתַּחַת—Arab. Erp. مَوْئِدُ اللَّهِ أَلْفَاوِي وَمِنْ أَلْفَاوِي أَلْفَاوِي أَلْفَاوِي وَمِنْ رَوْحِ مَوْئِدِ أَلْفَاوِي—Saad. —Gr. Ven. Χωρὸς θεοῦ φθαρτός, καὶ ὑπὸ πτερύγεσσι αἰώνιοις.—Such a strange diversity of rendering seldom occurs: yet not one of them, I think, gives the meaning of the original.—Nor have modern interpreters been more happy. Houbigant, for מְעוֹנָה, reads מַעְלָה; and, for חֲזָרְתָּ, with Sam. and thus renders: *Sursum habitat Deus æternus; erit deorsum fortitudo ejus sempiterna*.—Durell takes the preceding *Jeshurun* (or *Israel*) to be the antecedent to מְעוֹנָה, and with Houbigant, following the Sam. reading חֲזָרְתָּ, renders thus: “*Thou art the habitation of the eternal God, and under his everlasting arms*.”—Green supposes, that “the pronoun affix of the second person has been dropt after מְעוֹנָה, and that in the last period “the transcribers have changed the affix of the second person into the third”—and then renders thus: “The eternal God is thy refuge, and his everlasting arms thy support.”—Delgado thinks that מְעוֹנָה is closely connected with the last word in the preceding verse, and renders, (*which is*) the habitation of the antient God, and underneath are the everlasting arms.—I shall give yet three versions more:—that of Dathe: “*Perfugium est Deus antiquus, demittit brachium æternum*.”—That of Michaëlis: “*Wolken sind sie wohnung des uhrhalten Gottes, und unten spürt man den ewigen arm*.”—That of Hezel: “*Die wohnung des uralten Gottes; darunter seine uralten arme*.”—If any one of all these versions, antient or modern, satisfy the

* Read מְעוֹנָה, with Sam. and 19 mss.

† Read חֲזָרְתָּ, with 15 mss.

critical or uncritical reader, I am content; but they never could satisfy me. Our Bate alone, I think, though not often so happy, has here hit on the genuine meaning of his text.—*The Lord* is evidently the antecedent to *אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, which is the participle active of *אָלַף*, *summare*; and *אֱלֹהֵינוּ* is also the participle of the verb *אָלַף*, which, although it be ~~not~~ elsewhere used in Heb. is common in the Syr. and Æthiopic dialects, in the sense of *subjicere*, *deprimere*, *domare*. By *אֱלֹהֵינוּ* is not meant Jehovah the God of Israel, but the false gods of former times. Thus, the whole verse makes a suitable and natural continuation of ver. 26; without any alteration in the text, or constraint in rendering it. See my version.

Ver. 29. *On their high places ye shall trample*—*אֶת הַבָּמֹת יִדְמִימוּ*—Syr. *du eni tav tpaχχidh avrov eni bōm*—Vulg. *tu eorum colla calcabis*. They understood *בָּמֹת* in a metaphorical sense; and so do Onk. Tharg. Syr. both Arabs. and Perf.* The Gr. of Venice has *ἐν τοῖς ὕψουσιν*. I have, with our vulgar version, Durell, and Green †, rendered literally *high-places*; as I think the word refers to the places of pagan worship. Dathe renders: “*tu eorum terga calcabis*,” approved by Rosenmüller: “*alladitur (says he) ad morem orientalium antiquorum hostes devictos pedibus calcandi*.”—But Michaëlis and Herzl: “*und du trittest ihre höhen*.”—“*solst du ersteigen ihre höh'n*.”

CHAP. XXXIV.

Ver. 1. *AND the Lord showed him the whole land, from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates, and to the further sea.* This is all that is in the Sam. copy; but all the versions agree with the present Heb. and instead of the above general description have what follows in my version from the mark || to the end of ver. 3. The words “and to the further sea” are placed after “the land of Judah.” See Var. Read. and Explan. Note.—For the rest, it is not probable that this vision was a real distinct vision of all those regions; but only an ideal indication of the limits of the land. Yet from the tops of some mountains one may see a far way. Volney tells us that “from an artificial mount in the centre of the city of Aleppo, one sees to the north the snowy tops of the mountains of Beilan; on the west, those which separate the Orontes from the sea; while, to the south and east, the eye can discern as far as the Euphrates.” But Volney is not always a sure voucher.

Ver. 5. *So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died, &c.* In despite of this express account of the death of Moses, not only many Jews, but some good Christian fathers, think that he died not, but was snatched up to heaven alive! This, however, is not the common opinion of modern commentators, whether Christians or Jews.—A question here arises: Did Moses write this account of his own death and sepulture? Why not? (says Origen, after Josephus and Philo) since he was a prophet! The Jews, in general, think otherwise: they believe that this whole chapter was written by Joshua. The opinion of Jerom, that it was written by Ezra, is much more probable; although I would not positively affirm it. It is clear, however, that it must have been written after, and some considerable time after, Moses; from this expression, “unto this day no man knoweth aught of his sepulchre!”

* The Persian word is indeed rendered *excelsa* in the Polyglott: but it should be rendered *excelsus*, in a metaphorical meaning: that is, *high in dignity*: *בָּמֹת*. † He renders “fertile hills.”

Ver. 6. *And was buried*—מָקַר אִתּוֹ—*et sepelivit eum*. Who? "God," say some commentators, "by the ministry of his angels:" and the apostle Jude seems to say that it was Michael, who was charged with that office*. Others think, that "he buried himself;" that is, he retired into some secret cave and there expired, as in his tomb. Others believe, more rationally, that he was privately interred by Joshua and Eleazar. I think the Hebrew verb is to be taken impersonally, as Hebrew verbs often must be; and that the French *On l'ensevela* is a just translation: but, as we have no such impersonals, we must render passively.

Ver. 7. *Nor his vigour gone*—וְלֹא נָס לִוְיוֹ—Although the words themselves seem clear, yet they have been strangely rendered. Sep. *οὐδὲ εὐθραύησαν τὰ χεῖλα αὐτοῦ*—Vulg. *nec dentes illius moti sunt*—Onk. "nor was the beautiful splendour of his countenance changed"—Syr. "nor were his cheeks wrinkled"—all from the purpose. The word לוֹ signifies *greenness*, and metaphorically the *vigour* of life. The comma is well rendered by Saadiah: לֹא נָס לִוְיוֹ—*non recederat viror ejus*. The Erpenian Arab has almost the same words.

The chapter concludes with a short but high encomium of the Hebrew Legislator; not high enough, however, for his posterior panegyrist. The reader, who is curious to learn what the Rabbins say on this head, may turn to Munster's commentary in the second volume of the Sacred Critics, part ii. p. 283.

That the Hebrew Legislator was a great and a wise man, is clear, I think, from the whole tenour of his laws: but that all those laws were immediate emanations of an unerring Spirit, is far from being incontestable, and is no part of my belief. Nay, the God of Moses, JEHOVAH, if he really be such as he is described in the Pentateuch, is not the God whom I adore; nor the God whom I could love. The God whom I adore and love is the FATHER of our LORD JESUS: his Father and our Father; the Father of mercies and God of all consolation; who is no respecter of persons; who hateth not Esau and loveth Jacob; who visiteth *not* the sins of the father upon his children, even to the *first* generation; who willeth all men to be saved; who maketh his sun to rise on the bad and on the good, and sendeth salutary rain on the just and on the unjust.—Such is the God, whom I adore and love: and his singularly beloved Son, JESUS, I, next to him, worship as his Messenger of salvation, and the only Legislator whose laws are perfect and divine.

As there is yet a blank leaf of this half sheet, I add the following Latin lines; which were made in answer to a particular friend, who requested me to tell him, whether I thought Moses to have been inspired?

* Jude v. 9.

† Three mss. have וְלֹא, which I take to be the true reading.

AD AMICUM MEI AMANTISSIMUM J. D.

NUM fuerit MOSES cœlesti flamine motus ?

Quæris . . . Responsum hoc habe, Amice, meum.

Motus erat certo cœlesti flamine Moses ;

Moti quo Teutæ, Numa, Lycurgus erant.

Nempe omnes Sophiæ sacro de fonte biberunt :

Hanserunt largè Hi ; largius Ille tamen.

Nec tamen Hunc semper latices haussisse putato

Illimes ; luteas non semel hausit aquas.

Uni homini tantùm licuit deducere lymphas

Omnino puras . . . Ille homo CHRISTUS erat.

Ille etenim solus, divino Numine plenus,

Leges perfectas, jus sine labe tulit.

Ergo, alii fileant legum quicunque latores :

Mi JESUS CHRISTUS Legifer unus erit.

Ah ! possem tantùm tua, CHRISTE, absolvere dicta,

Tunc essent votis cuncta secunda meis.

Ast Tu, Nate Deo, qui cum PATRE omnia possis,

Tu mihi speratam, SPES mea ! Tu fer opem.

Per Te concessò, cœlesti robore sultus,

Promptus ego tua vestigia, CHRISTE, premam.

Nam tua calcanti vestigia sacra salutem

Es Tu pollicitus . . . Sed tua verba manent.

“ Me, me qui sequitur, tenebris non ambulat,” inquis :

En ego Te, possum quomodo, CHRISTE, sequor.

Sis mihi Tu Lumen ; sis semper clara Lucerna ;

Sis certum Indicium, Dux simul atque viæ.

Te Duce, callis ego metuenda pericula spernam

Angusti, et Tecum graviter astra petam.

FINIS.

